

Quantum Hall ferromagnetic states and spin-orbit interactions in the fractional regime

Stefano Chesi and Daniel Loss

Department of Physics, University of Basel, CH-4056 Basel, Switzerland

(Dated: February 20, 2019)

The competition between the Zeeman energy and the Rashba and Dresselhaus spin-orbit couplings is studied for fractional quantum Hall states by including correlation effects. A transition of the direction of the spin-polarization is predicted at specific values of the Zeeman energy. We show that these values can be expressed in terms of the pair-correlation function, which thus provides a way to obtain experimental access to the corresponding ground state. As specific examples, we consider the Laughlin wavefunctions and the 5/2-Pfaffian state and find indications of non-analytic features around the fractional states. We also include effects of the nuclear bath, becoming relevant in the mK-regime.

PACS numbers: 73.43.Cd, 71.71.Ej, 75.10.-b, 71.70.Jp

Two-dimensional electrons in strong magnetic fields have been for decades a rich source of new physical phenomena, of which the discovery of fractional quantum Hall states is a prominent example^{1,2}. At large cyclotron energy the ground state is well approximated assuming that a small number of low Landau Levels (LLs) are completely filled, while the large degeneracy of the partially filled highest LL is resolved by the electron interaction. The nature of the electron correlations within this level is highly nontrivial, and can be established by comparing the properties of trial wave-functions to experiments or exact numerical studies¹.

An additional spin degeneracy is obtained as the Zeeman coupling is reduced to zero, which can be achieved in GaAs/AlGaAs heterostructures by quantum confinement³, hydrostatic pressure⁴ or gate modulation⁵. Under these conditions, the ground state can still be spin polarized, due to the Coulomb interaction, but the polarization *direction* is determined by small spin anisotropies induced by the spin-orbit interaction. The effect of the spin-orbit coupling in the quantum Hall regime was studied in^{6,7,8,9,10,11,12}. There, it was shown that below a critical value of the Zeeman energy the spin polarization deviates from the perpendicular direction and acquires an in-plane component. The previous treatment, however, was restricted to the case of integer filling factors while we examine here the fractional regime. This represents a nontrivial extension, due to the highly correlated nature of the fractional wavefunctions, as opposed to the integer quantum Hall states. Furthermore, we obtain the effect of the simultaneous presence of Rashba and Dresselhaus spin-orbit couplings^{13,14}.

As a main result, we find that by including correlation effects the polarization transition explicitly depends on the specific form of quantum Hall ground state. This provides a new way to test in the laboratory the accuracy of proposed trial wave-functions in the fractional regime. While our discussion is generally applicable to polarized quantum Hall states, we choose to focus on the case of the $\nu = 5/2$ state, motivated by the special attention it has recently attracted (see for example^{15,16,17,18}). In fact, a possible scenario at half filling is a Fermi sea of

Composite Fermions (CF)¹⁹, but an incompressible state is observed instead^{20,21}. This is understood to arise from pairing of CFs²², consistent with the original proposal of a particular form of Pfaffian ground state supporting excitations with non-abelian statistics²³. This trial state was reasonably confirmed by numerical studies^{24,25} but it is still debated²⁶ and few experimental hints are available to establish its true relevance for real systems. Only very recently the remarkable observation of $e/4$ charged quasiparticles was reported¹⁸.

We assume in the following a high-field ground state with a partially occupied highest LL which is fully spin polarized along an arbitrary direction \vec{n} . Furthermore, a certain number J of lower LLs are fully occupied for both spin orientations. The anisotropy in the polarization direction \vec{n} is determined by the Zeeman energy and a general combination of Rashba (α) and Dresselhaus (β) spin-orbit interactions

$$\delta\hat{H} = \alpha(\hat{\pi}_x\hat{\sigma}_y - \hat{\pi}_y\hat{\sigma}_x) + \beta(\hat{\pi}_x\hat{\sigma}_x - \hat{\pi}_y\hat{\sigma}_y) - \frac{g\mu_B B}{2}\hat{\sigma}_z, \quad (1)$$

where $B > 0$ (an opposite polarization is obtained if the magnetic field \vec{B} is along $+\hat{z}$), and $\hat{\pi}/m$ is the standard kinematic velocity operator^{1,2}. Second-order perturbation theory in the spin-orbit interaction gives us the angular-dependent energy correction, expressed in terms of the standard spherical coordinates (θ, φ) of \vec{n}

$$\frac{\delta E}{pN} = \left\{ -\frac{g\mu_B B}{2} + [2J + 1 - \eta f_1(\eta, \nu)]m(\alpha^2 - \beta^2) \right\} \cos\theta - \frac{1}{2}\eta f_2(\eta, \nu) m(\alpha^2 + \beta^2 + 2\alpha\beta \sin 2\varphi) \sin^2\theta. \quad (2)$$

In Eq. (2), N is the total number of electrons, $p = (\nu - 2J)/\nu$ is the polarization degree without spin-orbit coupling, and we defined the interaction parameter $\eta = (e^2/\epsilon\ell)/\hbar\omega_c$, where $\omega_c = eB/mc$, $\ell = \sqrt{\hbar c/eB}$ is the magnetic length, and ϵ the dielectric constant. The general expressions for $f_{1,2}$ are provided in the Appendix and we discuss later their explicit form to leading order in η .

From Eq. (2) we immediately obtain that the azimuthal angle of the polarization \vec{n} is determined by

$\sin 2\varphi_m = \text{sign}(\alpha\beta)$, since we always find $f_2 > 0$. The anisotropy in the φ angle disappears for $\alpha = 0$ or $\beta = 0$ ^{6,7}. The polarization direction \vec{n} can be tilted from the vertical direction, in which case the polar angle is given by

$$\cos \theta_m = \frac{g\mu_B B - 2m\gamma_-^2 [2J + 1 - \eta f_1(\eta, \nu)]}{2m\gamma_+^2 \eta f_2(\eta, \nu)}, \quad (3)$$

where we defined $\gamma_{\pm}^2 = (|\alpha| + |\beta|)(|\alpha| \pm |\beta|)$. Eq. (3) can obviously be satisfied only in a limited region. It is easiest to consider the case in which the g -factor is changed at fixed external parameters^{3,4,5}. The transition from $-\hat{z}$ to $+\hat{z}$ is illustrated in the inset of Fig. 1. It occurs around a finite value g_c , which corresponds to the condition of in-plane polarization \vec{n}

$$g_c = \frac{2m\gamma_-^2}{\mu_B B} [2J + 1 - \eta f_1(\eta, \nu)], \quad (4)$$

and the transition region has a width of $2\Delta g$, where

$$\Delta g = \frac{2m\gamma_+^2}{\mu_B B} \eta f_2(\eta, \nu). \quad (5)$$

Without spin-orbit coupling one has the usual case $g_c = \Delta g = 0$, while for the non-interacting problem with spin-orbit interaction $g_c \neq 0$ only but still $\Delta g = 0$. Thus, the Coulomb interaction has the effect of inducing a shift $\sim \eta f_1$ in g_c and opens a finite region $\sim \eta f_2$ in which the polarization \vec{n} acquires an in-plane component. Notice also that, due to the different dependence on the spin-orbit couplings in Eqs. (4, 5), we obtain $g_c = 0$ but still $\Delta g \neq 0$ in the special case $|\alpha| = |\beta|$.

The effect of an in-plane component of the external field is straightforward to include in Eq. (2), via a term $\frac{1}{2}g\mu_B B_{\parallel} \cos(\varphi - \varphi_{\parallel}) \sin \theta$. This results in a correction to the equilibrium values (θ_m, φ_m) of the polarization \vec{n} which is anisotropic in the field angle φ_{\parallel} . In particular, also the out-of-plane component of \vec{n} is affected, with symmetry axes along the $\varphi_{\parallel} = \pm\pi/4$ directions.

A calculation of the full functional form of f_1 and f_2 is in general difficult, but the leading contribution due to the Coulomb interaction can be obtained explicitly in the limit of high magnetic fields. Details are provided in the Appendix, where we express $f_{1,2}$ and the energy in terms of a single $\{c_m\}$ parametrization introduced by Girvin²⁷ for the pair-correlation function in the lowest LL. It is these c_m -coefficients that depend on the specific ground state.

For our problem we find (see Appendix), at $0 < \nu < 1$,

$$f_1(0, \nu) = f_2(0, \nu) = \frac{\nu}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} + \nu \sum'_m \frac{c_m \Gamma(m - 1/2)}{4m!}, \quad (6)$$

and at $2 < \nu < 3$,

$$f_1(0, \nu) = \frac{3\nu - 2}{8} \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} + (\nu - 2) \sum'_m \frac{c_m \Gamma(m - 5/2)}{256m!} \times 3(8m - 15)(8m - 5), \quad (7)$$

	CF	Pf		CF	Pf
c_1	-0.5699	-0.4205	c_9	-0.3518	0.8761
c_3	0.4559	0.0333	c_{11}	0.9403	-1.406
c_5	-0.0261	0.3521	c_{13}	-0.7151	1.170
c_7	-0.1660	-0.4853	c_{15}	0.1825	-0.3703

TABLE I: Parameterization $\{c_m\}$ of the pair-correlation function for polarized CF sea and Pfaffian (Pf) wavefunction.

$$f_2(0, \nu) = \frac{7(\nu - 2)}{8} \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} + (\nu - 2) \sum'_m \frac{c_m \Gamma(m - 5/2)}{256m!} \times (105 - 112m + 64m^2), \quad (8)$$

where the summations are restricted to positive odd integers. The remarkable result $f_1 = f_2$ when $0 < \nu < 1$ is only established perturbatively, and might change at higher orders in η .

As a first application, we consider now the case of the Laughlin trial wavefunctions, which are appropriate for $\nu = 1/M$ where M is an odd integer. For simplicity, we adopted the approximation used in²⁷. This amounts to set $c_m = -1$ for $m < M$ and $c_m = 0$ for $m > M + 4$. The three remaining coefficients are determined by exact sum rules²⁷. In particular, we obtain

$$f_{1,2}(0, 1/3) = 0.0710, \quad f_{1,2}(0, 1/5) = 0.0301, \quad (9)$$

which show small deviations for more accurate parameterizations of the $\{c_m\}$ coefficients (e.g. using the $\{c_m\}$ of²⁸ gives $f_{1,2} = 0.0708, 0.0300$). The same approximation is used at $\nu = 2 + 1/M$ and, by making use of the particle-hole symmetry (see Appendix), the states at $\nu = 1 - 1/M$ and $\nu = 3 - 1/M$ can also be studied.

We turn now to the special case of $\nu = 1/2, 5/2$, and compare the Pfaffian (Pf) state to the polarized CF sea. These are described by the two parameterizations listed in Table I, which we obtained from fitting the pair-correlation functions of 36 electrons given in²⁹. This gives at $\nu = 1/2$

$$f_{1,2}^{CF}(0, 1/2) = 0.20, \quad f_{1,2}^{Pf}(0, 1/2) = 0.22, \quad (10)$$

and at $\nu = 5/2$

$$f_1^{CF}(0, 5/2) = 1.16, \quad f_1^{Pf}(0, 5/2) = 1.01, \quad (11)$$

$$f_2^{CF}(0, 5/2) = 0.49, \quad f_2^{Pf}(0, 5/2) = 0.45. \quad (12)$$

Evidently, the specific values of f_1 and f_2 are sensitive to the microscopic details of the ground state. In particular, at $\nu = 5/2$, the comparison between the CF sea and the Pfaffian state shows a $\sim 10\%$ difference in the values of $f_{1,2}$ in (11) and (12). We note that this difference is significantly larger than the relative difference of total energies²⁹.

The values of f_1 and f_2 can be accessed through the measurement of g_c and Δg [see Eqs. (4) and (5)], which makes them an experimentally relevant characterization




FIG. 1: Values of g_c (negative dots) and Δg (positive dots), as obtained from Eqs. (4, 5) for states at $\nu = 1/M$ (and their particle-hole conjugates), and $\nu = 1/2$. The solid lines are a guide for the eye. The density is chosen such that $B = 5/\nu$ (in T), $\alpha = 0$, and other parameters are given in the main text. In the transition region around the g_c curve (gray area) the spin direction is tilted away from the vertical direction. The lower boundary of this region corresponds also to the noninteracting value for g_c . Inset: general plot of the polarization angle θ_m [see Eq. (3)] as a function of the g -factor.

of the quantum Hall state. As it is clear from Eqs. (6-8) $f_{1,2}$ provide information about the c_m coefficients defining the pair-correlation function. An interesting possibility is offered by truncating the series (6-8) to the two lowest coefficients c_1 and c_3 . This allows one to get an estimate of c_1 and c_3 from the two experimentally measured values of f_1 and f_2 . For example, using our ‘exact’ values of $f_{1,2}$ in (11, 12) one obtains for the Pfaffian state $c_{1,3} \simeq -0.43, 0.07$, which is in reasonable agreement with Table I and allows one to clearly distinguish the Pfaffian state from the CF sea. This procedure is well justified since the c_m prefactors in Eqs. (7, 8) decrease rapidly like $m^{-5/2}$.

An interesting case is also given by the $\nu = 7/3$ value, for which it would be possible to test the Laughling character of the ground-state by an approximate measurement of c_1 through $f_{1,2}$. In fact, a value $c_1 \simeq -1$ would be consistent with the small distance behavior of the Laughlin pair-correlation function ($\sim r^6$).

Let us now estimate the effects for typical GaAs parameters, and thereby demonstrate that our predictions are within experimental reach. [A similar estimate can be repeated for AlGaAs structures, of the type of Ref.⁵.] We evaluate Eqs. (4, 5) using $m = 0.067m_0$, $\epsilon = 12.4$, and for a symmetric well with thickness $L = 6$ nm, which is close to the value at which the g -factor is zero^{3,4}. We obtain for the Dresselhaus coupling $\hbar\beta = \lambda(\pi/L)^2 \simeq 27$ meVÅ, where $\lambda \simeq 10$ eVÅ³ (see also³⁰), and $\alpha = 0$. The results for g_c and Δg are plotted in Figs. 1 and 2 in the range $0 < \nu < 1$ and $2 < \nu < 3$, respectively. Here we assumed a constant density $\rho = 1.21 \times 10^{11}$ cm⁻² in the first case and $\rho = 3.02 \times 10^{11}$ cm⁻² for the second one. The latter value roughly corresponds to²⁰. As seen, the values of g_c , Δg are not unreasonably small, and in the range already realized in practice^{3,4,5}.

In the following, we add a few comments about our main results presented in Figs. 1 and 2. Our trial wave




FIG. 2: Same as Fig. 1, in the range $2 < \nu < 3$. At $\nu = 5/2$ both CF sea and Pfaffian (Pf) results are displayed. The solid curves are a guide for the eye, highlighting the expected cusps at the Pfaffian values. The transition region is given by the gray area and the noninteracting g_c is the lowest dashed line. The density is such that $B = 12.5/\nu$ (in T) and $\alpha = 0$.

functions lead to discrete values of g_c , Δg for points in the intervals $0 < \nu < 1$ and $2 < \nu < 3$ (see Figs. 1 and 2). As done in³¹ for the energy, we smoothly interpolate between these points (see solid lines in Figs. 1 and 2) and thus extend our results to general ν . However, such a smooth interpolation does not reflect the presence of derivative discontinuities in f_1, f_2 . In fact the expressions (6-8) are determined by the $\{c_m\}$ coefficients, which have a non-analytic dependence on ν . This is clear from the presence of cusps in the ground-state energy³², which necessarily follows from the incompressibility of the quantum Hall states, and from the analytic dependence of the energy from the $\{c_m\}$ parameterizations (see (A.24), (A.25)). While the energy cusps are downward, the same does not hold in general for f_1, f_2 (see Appendix).

Nevertheless, for the particular case $\nu = 5/2$ we can infer the qualitative form of this cusp, based on the following argument. If at $\nu = 5/2$ a noninteracting CF sea were realized, the g_c , Δg curves would go smoothly through the CF values shown in Fig. 2. By adiabatically switching on the CFs interactions to their full value, these smooth theoretical CF curves evolve to the real ones, which display cusps at $\nu = 5/2$. Since the Pfaffian values of g_c , Δg are lower than the CF sea ones, we suggest the presence of two *downward* cusps in g_c and Δg of which the former is much more pronounced. This is illustrated in Fig. 2.

Although our treatment is strictly valid only at low temperatures, when at $\nu = 5/2$ an incompressible state is realized, a possibility to directly observe the CF sea result is to consider higher temperatures. Under these conditions, the existence of a Fermi sea was experimentally demonstrated in³³. A plausible scenario is that the cusps in Fig. 2 vanish upon approaching the CF sea values when the temperature exceeds the pairing energy (but remains still smaller than the CF kinetic energy).

Concerning the regime of validity of the perturbative treatment, we observe that η is often not particularly small under the typical conditions at which the $\nu = 5/2$ state is observed ($\eta \simeq 0.74$ at the highest field 12.6 T in³⁴) and measurements at higher magnetic fields would




FIG. 3: Plot of the values of g_c (negative) and Δg (positive) from Eqs. (4) and (5) at $\nu = 5/2$, $B > 5$ T and other parameters as in the text. The solid and dashed lines correspond to the Pfaffian state and CF sea, resp. [$f_{1,2}$ as in Eqs. (11, 12)]. The dotted line is the linear noninteracting contribution to g_c ($f_1 = 0$). The dots mark the B -field values of 20 and 34 .

be desirable. We show in Fig. 3 the magnetic field dependence of g_c , Δg from the leading-order approximation of Eqs. (4) and (5), at $B > 5$ T. The f_1 -coefficient can be extracted from the high field $\propto 1/\sqrt{B^3}$ corrections to the noninteracting background, which is linear in $1/B$. The f_2 -coefficient represents the leading $\propto 1/\sqrt{B^3}$ contribution to Δg .

Concerning the assumption of full polarization of the highest LL, this always holds at particular values of ν (e.g. $\nu = 1/M$ and $\nu = 5/2$). At general ν , full polarization around g_c can always be obtained if the spin-orbit coupling is sufficiently large. If g_c is small in magnitude, the ground state can be unpolarized (e.g. $\nu = 1/2, 2/3$) or partially polarized (e.g. $\nu = 3/5, 3/7$). For the latter case a similar polarization transition is expected, driven to leading order by the noninteracting contribution ($f_{1,2} = 0$), but our calculation of the interaction corrections does not apply.

Finally, one has to note that at ultra-low temperatures at which the $\nu = 5/2$ state is observed, there is a significant effect from the nuclear spin bath. This contribution can be easily included in the previous discussion by interpreting the g -factor occurring in Eq. (1) as $g = g_e - \sum_i x_i A_i \langle \hat{I}_z \rangle_i / \mu_B B$, where g_e is the ‘bare’ electron g -factor of the heterostructure and the second term is the Overhauser shift produced by the hyperfine interaction. Here, x_i are the fractions relative to the different nuclear species (equal to 0.5, 0.3, 0.2 for ^{75}As , ^{69}Ga , ^{71}Ga , respectively) and A_i are the corresponding hyperfine couplings (with estimated values³⁵ 94, 77, 99 μeV). In Fig. 4 we plot the shift $g - g_e$ as function of the temperature T for different values of B . The high temperature limit gives $g - g_e \simeq 0.9/T$ (T in mK), independent of B . We see that a change of temperature might provide a practical way of tuning the small Zeeman energies involved.

In conclusion, we suggest that measurements of the spin polarization at vanishing Zeeman energy would constitute an interesting test for the nature of the fractional quantum Hall ground states. Polarization measurements were performed in the lowest LL with established exper-




FIG. 4: Nuclear shift of the hyperfined modified electron g -factor (see text) as a function of temperature T at different values of B . In the inset, the average nuclear polarization $\langle I \rangle = \sum_i x_i \langle \hat{I}_z \rangle_i$ is also shown.

imental techniques, as in particular photoluminescence³⁶ or NMR studies³⁷. In the second LL, the very fact of maximal polarization at $\nu = 5/2$ is currently strongly believed on the basis of theoretical arguments^{24,25} and indirect experimental evidence³⁴, but a direct observation is missing and would be valuable in itself.

Financial support by the NCCR Nanoscience and the Swiss NSF is acknowledged.

APPENDIX

We discuss here the general expressions for $f_{1,2}$ and their derivation to leading order in the Coulomb interaction parameter $\eta = (e^2/\epsilon\ell)/\hbar\omega_c$. For a magnetic field along $-\hat{z}$ we take single-particle wavefunctions of the form

$$\varphi_{0,n}(z) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\ell^2 n!}} \left(\frac{z}{\sqrt{2}\ell} \right)^n e^{-|z|^2/4\ell^2}, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$\varphi_{j,n}(z) = i\sqrt{\frac{2}{j}} \left(\frac{z^*}{4\ell} - \ell \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \right) \varphi_{j-1,n}(z), \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where $z = (x + iy)/\ell$ and $j, n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. Here j is the Landau Level (LL) index and the angular momentum is $n - j$. With this choice, the spin-orbit interaction assumes the form

$$\hat{H}_{SO} = \frac{i\hbar\alpha}{\ell} \sum_{j,n} \sqrt{2j} (\hat{a}_{j-1,n,\downarrow}^\dagger \hat{a}_{j,n,\uparrow} - \hat{a}_{j,n,\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{a}_{j-1,n,\downarrow}) + \frac{\hbar\beta}{\ell} \sum_{j,n} \sqrt{2j} (\hat{a}_{j-1,n,\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{a}_{j,n,\downarrow} + \hat{a}_{j,n,\downarrow}^\dagger \hat{a}_{j-1,n,\uparrow}) \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where the spin quantization axis is along $+\hat{z}$.

1. Definition of $f_{1,2}$

The second-order contribution to the energy from the spin-orbit interaction is $\delta E = \sum_\alpha |\langle \Omega | \hat{H}_{SO} | \alpha \rangle|^2 / (E_\Omega -$

E_α) where $|\Omega\rangle$ and $|\alpha\rangle$ denote the ground state and excited states respectively. These we suppose are full eigenstates of the interacting Hamiltonian, including LL mixing, with energy $E_{\Omega,\alpha}$ and spin quantized along \vec{n} .

This energy correction δE corresponds to Eq. (2) in the main text (when $g = 0$). The general angular dependence can be obtained applying to Eq. (A.3) a spin rotation to the \vec{n} direction

$$\hat{a}_{j,n,\uparrow}^\dagger = (\cos\theta/2 \hat{a}_{j,n,+}^\dagger + \sin\theta/2 \hat{a}_{j,n,-}^\dagger) e^{i\varphi/2}, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

$$\hat{a}_{j,n,\downarrow}^\dagger = (\sin\theta/2 \hat{a}_{j,n,+}^\dagger - \cos\theta/2 \hat{a}_{j,n,-}^\dagger) e^{-i\varphi/2} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

By a straightforward calculation we find that the angular-dependent contribution has the form $C_1 m(\alpha^2 - \beta^2) \cos\theta + C_2(\alpha^2 + \beta^2 + 2\alpha\beta \sin 2\varphi) \sin^2\theta$. This can be expressed as in Eq. (2) in the main text, where $f_{1,2}$ are defined by the following identities

$$\eta f_1(\eta, \nu) = 2J + 1 + \frac{1}{pN} \sum_{\alpha,j,n,\mu} \frac{\hbar^2/m\ell^2}{E_\Omega - E_\alpha} \mu j \quad (\text{A.6})$$

$$\times |\langle \Omega | \hat{a}_{j-1,n,\mu}^\dagger \hat{a}_{j,n,-\mu} + \hat{a}_{j,n,-\mu}^\dagger \hat{a}_{j-1,n,\mu} | \alpha \rangle|^2,$$

$$\eta f_2(\eta, \nu) = -\frac{1}{pN} \sum_{\alpha,j,n,\mu} \frac{\hbar^2/m\ell^2}{E_\Omega - E_\alpha} \mu j \quad (\text{A.7})$$

$$\times |\langle \Omega | \hat{a}_{j-1,n,+}^\dagger \hat{a}_{j,n,\mu} - \hat{a}_{j,n,-}^\dagger \hat{a}_{j-1,n,-\mu} - \hat{a}_{j-1,n,-}^\dagger \hat{a}_{j,n,-\mu} + \hat{a}_{j,n,+}^\dagger \hat{a}_{j-1,n,\mu} | \alpha \rangle|^2,$$

where $2J < \nu < 2J + 1$ and $p = (\nu - 2J)/\nu$ is the ground-state polarization. The right-hand sides of Eqs. (A.6, A.7) are difficult to evaluate in general, but they are found to vanish in the noninteracting case. Therefore, $f_{1,2}$ express the contribution to $C_{1,2}$ due to the Coulomb interaction.

2. Calculation of $f_{1,2}$ to leading order

By expanding the the eigenstates $|\Omega\rangle$, $|\alpha\rangle$ and the corresponding energies to first order in \hat{V}_{ee} , the following standard third-order contribution is obtained

$$\begin{aligned} \delta E_3 = & \sum_{a,b} \frac{\langle 0 | \hat{V}_{ee} | a \rangle \langle a | \hat{H}_{SO} | b \rangle \langle b | \hat{H}_{SO} | 0 \rangle + \text{c.c.}}{(E_0 - E_a)(E_0 - E_b)} \\ & + \sum_{a,b} \frac{\langle 0 | \hat{H}_{SO} | a \rangle \langle a | \hat{V}_{ee} | b \rangle \langle b | \hat{H}_{SO} | 0 \rangle}{(E_0 - E_a)(E_0 - E_b)} \\ & - \langle 0 | \hat{V}_{ee} | 0 \rangle \sum_a \frac{|\langle 0 | \hat{H}_{SO} | a \rangle|^2}{(E_0 - E_a)^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

where $|0\rangle$ is the ground state, that we assume has a fully polarized highest LL, and $|a\rangle$, $|b\rangle$ are excited states. All the unperturbed states are now non-interacting eigenstates, but are chosen to diagonalize V_{ee} to lowest order.

It is seen from (A.3) that the spin-orbit interaction produces single $\pm\hbar\omega_c$ excitations, and at the same time

changes the angular momentum by ∓ 1 . Therefore, the total angular momentum cannot be conserved in the first term of (A.8), which is vanishing. Furthermore, $E_a - E_0 = E_b - E_0 = \hbar\omega_c$ and

$$\delta E_3 = \frac{\langle 0 | \hat{H}_{SO} \hat{V}_{ee} \hat{H}_{SO} | 0 \rangle - \langle 0 | \hat{V}_{ee} | 0 \rangle \langle 0 | \hat{H}_{SO}^2 | 0 \rangle}{(\hbar\omega_c)^2} \quad (\text{A.9})$$

which involves averages of strings of $a_{j,m,\sigma}^\dagger$, $a_{j,m,\sigma}$ operators on our particular choice of ground state $|0\rangle$. By spin rotation and appropriate evaluation of such averages, one obtains an expression in which the only non-trivial matrix elements are of the form $\langle 0 | \hat{a}_{J,m,+}^\dagger \hat{a}_{J,p,+}^\dagger \hat{a}_{J,q,+} \hat{a}_{J,n,+} | 0 \rangle$. In fact, also terms containing a string of six J operators appear, but in this case the form of \hat{H}_{SO} is such that a factor $\sum_n \hat{a}_{J,n,\mu}^\dagger \hat{a}_{J,n,\mu}$ can be extracted to act directly on $|0\rangle$.

Therefore, the final result can be expressed in terms of the following interaction coefficients

$$\begin{aligned} V_{i,j}^{h,k} = & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n,m,p,q} \langle 0 | \hat{a}_{J,m,+}^\dagger \hat{a}_{J,p,+}^\dagger \hat{a}_{J,q,+} \hat{a}_{J,n,+} | 0 \rangle \quad (\text{A.10}) \\ & \times \langle \varphi_{i,m}(\mathbf{r}_1) \varphi_{h,p}(\mathbf{r}_2) | V_{ee}(r_{12}) | \varphi_{k,q}(\mathbf{r}_2) \varphi_{j,n}(\mathbf{r}_1) \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where $V_{ee}(r_{12}) = \frac{e^2}{\epsilon r_{12}} - \frac{1}{L^2} \int \frac{e^2}{\epsilon r} d\mathbf{r}$, which accounts of the the neutralizing background. In the range $0 < \nu < 1$ we have

$$\delta E_3 = \frac{2m\gamma_-^2}{\hbar\omega_c} \left(V_{0,0}^{0,0} - V_{1,1}^{0,0} \right) \cos\theta - \frac{m\gamma_+^2}{\hbar\omega_c} V_{1,0}^{0,1} \cos^2\theta, \quad (\text{A.11})$$

where we have used $\sin 2\varphi = \text{sign}(\alpha\beta)$. Eq. (A.11) is further simplified using the identity $V_{1,0}^{0,1} = V_{0,0}^{0,0} - V_{1,1}^{0,0}$. For $2 < \nu < 3$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta E_3 = & \frac{2m\gamma_-^2}{\hbar\omega_c} \left(V_{1,1}^{0,0} + V_{1,1}^{1,1} - 2 V_{2,2}^{1,1} - \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \frac{e^2}{\epsilon \ell} pN \right) \cos\theta \\ & - \frac{m\gamma_+^2}{\hbar\omega_c} \left(V_{1,0}^{0,1} + 2 V_{2,1}^{1,2} - 2\sqrt{2} V_{1,2}^{1,0} \right) \cos^2\theta. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Comparing $\delta E = pN[-g\mu_B B/2 + (2J + 1)\gamma_-^2] \cos\theta + \delta E_3$ with Eq. (2) in the main text, we obtain explicit formulas for f_1 , f_2 in terms of the $V_{i,j}^{h,k}$ coefficients. At $0 < \nu < 1$

$$f_1(0, \nu) = f_2(0, \nu) = -2 \frac{V_{1,0}^{0,1}}{N e^2 / \epsilon \ell}, \quad (\text{A.13})$$

and at $2 < \nu < 3$

$$f_1(0, \nu) = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{8}} - 2 \frac{V_{1,1}^{0,0} + V_{1,1}^{1,1} - 2 V_{2,2}^{1,1}}{pN e^2 / \epsilon \ell}, \quad (\text{A.14})$$

$$f_2(0, \nu) = -2 \frac{V_{1,0}^{0,1} + 2 V_{2,1}^{1,2} - 2\sqrt{2} V_{1,2}^{1,0}}{pN e^2 / \epsilon \ell}. \quad (\text{A.15})$$

3. Calculation of $V_{i,j}^{h,k}$

It is straightforward to obtain $V_{i,j}^{h,k}$ from the corresponding ‘generalized’ pair-correlation functions $g_{i,j}^{h,k}$

$$V_{i,j}^{h,k} = \frac{(p\rho)^2}{2} \int \frac{e^2}{\epsilon r_{12}} [g_{i,j}^{h,k}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) - \delta_{i,j} \delta_{h,k}] d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{r}_2, \quad (\text{A.16})$$

where

$$g_{i,j}^{h,k}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = \frac{1}{(p\rho)^2} \sum_{n,m,p,q} \langle 0 | \hat{a}_{J,m,+}^\dagger \hat{a}_{J,p,+}^\dagger \hat{a}_{J,q,+} \hat{a}_{J,n,+} | 0 \rangle \times \varphi_{i,m}^*(\mathbf{r}_1) \varphi_{h,p}^*(\mathbf{r}_2) \varphi_{k,q}(\mathbf{r}_2) \varphi_{j,n}(\mathbf{r}_1) \quad (\text{A.17})$$

and $p\rho = \frac{\nu-2J}{2\pi\ell^2}$ is the fraction of the electron density in the highest LL.

The lowest-order case $g_{0,0}^{0,0}$ is the ordinary pair-correlation function for the ground-state, expressed as a wavefunction in the lowest LL, as it is customary also for $J > 0^1$. For a homogeneous isotropic state this is conveniently expressed in the form²⁷

$$g_{0,0}^{0,0} = 1 - e^{-|z|^2/2\ell^2} + \sum_m' \frac{2}{m!} \left(\frac{|z|^2}{4\ell^2} \right)^m c_m e^{-|z|^2/4\ell^2}, \quad (\text{A.18})$$

where $z = z_1 - z_2$ ($z_\alpha = x_\alpha + iy_\alpha$) and the prime indicates a summation over positive odd values of m only. Note that here the parameters c_m depend explicitly on the specific ground state $|0\rangle$. At higher order analytic expressions are obtained from multiple derivatives of $g_{0,0}^{0,0}$, according to the definitions (A.17) and (A.2). In particular, the following recursive relations hold

$$-i\sqrt{2}\ell \frac{\partial g_{i,j}^{h,k}}{\partial z_1} = \sqrt{j+1} g_{i,j+1}^{h,k} - \sqrt{i} g_{i-1,j}^{h,k}, \quad (\text{A.19})$$

$$i\sqrt{2}\ell \frac{\partial g_{i,j}^{h,k}}{\partial z_1^*} = \sqrt{i+1} g_{i+1,j}^{h,k} - \sqrt{j} g_{i,j-1}^{h,k}, \quad (\text{A.20})$$

$$-i\sqrt{2}\ell \frac{\partial g_{i,j}^{h,k}}{\partial z_2} = \sqrt{k+1} g_{i,j}^{h,k+1} - \sqrt{h} g_{i,j}^{h-1,k}, \quad (\text{A.21})$$

$$i\sqrt{2}\ell \frac{\partial g_{i,j}^{h,k}}{\partial z_2^*} = \sqrt{h+1} g_{i,j}^{h+1,k} - \sqrt{k} g_{i,j}^{h,k-1}, \quad (\text{A.22})$$

As an example, the expression required to obtain $f_{1,2}$ at $0 < \nu < 1$ reads

$$g_{1,0}^{0,1} = \left(\frac{|z|^2}{2\ell^2} - 1 \right) e^{-|z|^2/2\ell^2} - \sum_m' \frac{1}{m!} \left(\frac{|z|^2}{4\ell^2} \right)^{m-1} \times \left[m^2 - (2m+1) \frac{|z|^2}{4\ell^2} + \frac{|z|^4}{16\ell^4} \right] c_m e^{-|z|^2/4\ell^2}. \quad (\text{A.23})$$

The explicit form of $V_{i,j}^{h,k}$ easily follows. In particular, the quantities $V_{J,J}^{J,J}$ are required for the total energy of a trial wavefunction in a generic LL. For $J = 0$ the total

energy is $V_{0,0}^{0,0}$

$$\frac{V_{0,0}^{0,0}}{L^2(e^2/\epsilon\ell)} = \frac{\nu^2}{2\pi\ell^2} \left[-\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{8}} + \sum_m' \frac{c_m \Gamma(m+1/2)}{m!} \right], \quad (\text{A.24})$$

while for $J = 1$ the energy is $V_{1,1}^{1,1} - N\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{8}} \frac{e^2}{\epsilon\ell}$, where the constant is due to the presence of a filled lowest LL. We obtain

$$\frac{V_{1,1}^{1,1}}{L^2(e^2/\epsilon\ell)} = \frac{(\nu-2)^2}{2\pi\ell^2} \left[-\frac{3}{4}\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{8}} + \sum_m' \frac{c_m \Gamma(m-3/2)}{64m!} \times (8m-11)(8m-3) \right]. \quad (\text{A.25})$$

Similar expressions for $f_{1,2}$ are also derived and presented in the main text. For convenience, we repeat them here. At $0 < \nu < 1$,

$$f_1(0, \nu) = f_2(0, \nu) = \frac{\nu}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} + \nu \sum_m' \frac{c_m \Gamma(m-1/2)}{4m!}, \quad (\text{A.26})$$

and at $2 < \nu < 3$,

$$f_1(0, \nu) = \frac{3\nu-2}{8} \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} + (\nu-2) \sum_m' \frac{c_m \Gamma(m-5/2)}{256m!} \times 3(8m-15)(8m-5), \quad (\text{A.27})$$

$$f_2(0, \nu) = \frac{7(\nu-2)}{8} \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} + (\nu-2) \sum_m' \frac{c_m \Gamma(m-5/2)}{256m!} \times (105 - 112m + 64m^2). \quad (\text{A.28})$$

These can be compared to the energy expansions. In particular, (A.26) to (A.24) and (A.27, A.28) to (A.25). We do not find any general relation among them, except in the simple situation when a single low-order c_m coefficient gives the main contribution. Then, $f_{1,2}$ and the energy are related through the ratios of the prefactors of this particular c_m . For example, concerning the cusps in $f_{1,2}$, we find that they are generally downward as for the energy, with the only exception of f_1 in the range $2 < \nu < 3$. In fact, the ratio of the c_1 prefactors in (A.27) and (A.25) is negative, which gives an upward cusp for f_1 .

We also note that the method described in this section is immediately applicable to a modified two-body interaction, which for example occurs for a finite thickness of the sample. In fact, the expansion of the $V_{i,j}^{h,k}$ in terms of the $\{c_m\}$ parameterization is obtained by a (possibly numeric) term-by-term integration of the exact expressions of the corresponding $g_{i,j}^{h,k}$.

4. Electron-hole symmetry

For a ground state with $2J < \nu < 2J+1$ and fully polarized highest LL, one can construct the ground state

at $4J + 1 - \nu$ and same magnetic field B by making use of the electron-hole symmetry in the polarized LL. This allows to obtain a relation between the $V_{i,j}^{h,k}$ at conjugated filling factors. At $0 < \nu < 1$ it reads

$$V_{i,j}^{h,k}(1-\nu) = (1-2\nu)V_{i,j}^{h,k}(1) + (-1)^{i+j+h+k}V_{i,j}^{h,k}(\nu), \quad (\text{A.29})$$

and at $2 < \nu < 3$

$$V_{i,j}^{h,k}(5-\nu) = (5-2\nu)V_{i,j}^{h,k}(3) + (-1)^{i+j+h+k}V_{i,j}^{h,k}(\nu). \quad (\text{A.30})$$

The corresponding relations for $f_{1,2}(\eta, \nu)$, are also obtained (if $\eta = 0$). In the range of $0 < \nu < 1$ the two coefficients $f_{1,2}$ are equal and

$$f_{1,2}(0, 5-\nu) = \frac{(1-2\nu)f_{1,2}(0,1) + \nu f_{1,2}(0,\nu)}{1-\nu}, \quad (\text{A.31})$$

where $f_{1,2}(0,1) = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{8}}$. At $2 < \nu < 3$ we obtain for the function $f_2(0, \nu)$ the following relation

$$f_2(0, 5-\nu) = \frac{(5-2\nu)f_2(0,3) + (\nu-2)f_2(0,\nu)}{3-\nu}, \quad (\text{A.32})$$

which is not satisfied by $f_1(0, \nu)$. Instead, one has to apply the transformation (A.32) to the function $\tilde{f}_1(0, \nu) = f_1(0, \nu) - \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{8}}$. Finally, we have $f_1(0, 3) = f_2(0, 3) = \frac{7}{8}\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}}$.

-
- ¹ J. K. Jain, *Composite Fermions* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007).
- ² G. F. Giuliani and G. Vignale, *Quantum Theory of the Electron Liquid* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2005).
- ³ M. J. Snelling, G. P. Flinn, A. S. Plaut, R. T. Harley, A. C. Tropper, R. Eccleston, and C. C. Phillips, Phys. Rev. B **44**, 11345 (1991).
- ⁴ D. K. Maude, M. Potemski, J. C. Portal, M. Henini, L. Eaves, G. Hill, and M. A. Pate, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 4604 (1996).
- ⁵ G. Salis, Y. Kato, K. Ensslin, D. C. Driscoll, A. C. Gossard, and D. D. Awschalom, Nature **414**, 619 (2001).
- ⁶ V. I. Fal'ko and S. V. Iordanskii, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 127 (2000).
- ⁷ J. Schliemann, J. C. Egues, and D. Loss, Phys. Rev. B **67**, 085302 (2003).
- ⁸ W. Desrat, F. Giazotto, V. Pellegrini, M. Governale, F. Beltram, F. Capotondi, G. Biasiol, and L. Sorba, Phys. Rev. B **71**, 153314 (2005).
- ⁹ M. Zarea and S. E. Ulloa, Phys. Rev. B **72**, 085342 (2005).
- ¹⁰ E. Y. Sherman and J. E. Sipe, Phys. Rev. B **73**, 205335 (2006).
- ¹¹ M. Valín-Rodríguez and R. G. Nazmitdinov, Phys. Rev. B **73**, 235306 (2006).
- ¹² E. Lipparini, M. Barranco, F. Malet, M. Pi, and L. Serra, Phys. Rev. B **74**, 115303 (2006).
- ¹³ Y. A. Bychkov and E. I. Rashba, J. Phys. C **17**, 6039 (1984).
- ¹⁴ G. Dresselhaus, Phys. Rev. **100**, 580 (1955).
- ¹⁵ J. B. Miller, I. P. Radu, D. M. Zumbühl, E. M. Levenson-Falk, M. A. Kastner, C. M. Marcus, L. N. Pfeiffer, and K. W. West, Nature Physics **3**, 561 (2007).
- ¹⁶ C. Nayak, S. H. Simon, A. Stern, M. Freedman, and S. Das Sarma, arXiv:0707.1889 (2007).
- ¹⁷ X. Wan, Z.-X. Hu, E. H. Rezayi, and K. Yang, arXiv:0712.2095 (2007).
- ¹⁸ M. Dolev, M. Heiblum, V. Umansky, A. Stern, and D. Mahalu, arXiv:0802.0930 (2008).
- ¹⁹ B. I. Halperin, P. A. Lee, and N. Read, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 7312 (1993).
- ²⁰ R. Willett, J. P. Eisenstein, H. L. Störmer, D. C. Tsui, A. C. Gossard, and J. H. English, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59**, 1776 (1987).
- ²¹ W. Pan, J.-S. Xia, V. Shvarts, D. E. Adams, H. L. Stormer, D. C. Tsui, L. N. Pfeiffer, K. W. Baldwin, and K. W. West, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 3530 (1999).
- ²² N. Read and D. Green, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 10267 (2000).
- ²³ G. Moore and N. Read, Nucl. Phys. B **360**, 362 (1991).
- ²⁴ R. H. Morf, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 1505 (1998).
- ²⁵ E. H. Rezayi and F. D. M. Haldane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 4685 (2000).
- ²⁶ C. Toke, N. Regnault, and J. K. Jain, arXiv:0707.0586 (2007).
- ²⁷ S. M. Girvin, Phys. Rev. B **30**, 558 (1984).
- ²⁸ A. H. MacDonald and S. M. Girvin, Phys. Rev. B **34**, 5639 (1986).
- ²⁹ K. Park, V. Melik-Alaverdian, N. E. Bonesteel, and J. K. Jain, Phys. Rev. B **58**, R10167 (1998).
- ³⁰ J. J. Krich and B. I. Halperin, EPAPS Document E-PRLTAO-98-029722 (2007).
- ³¹ D. Levesque, J. J. Weis, and A. H. MacDonald, Phys. Rev. B **30**, 1056 (1984).
- ³² B. I. Halperin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **52**, 1583 (1984).
- ³³ R. L. Willett, K. W. West, and L. N. Pfeiffer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 066801 (2002).
- ³⁴ W. Pan, H. L. Stormer, D. C. Tsui, L. N. Pfeiffer, K. W. Baldwin, and K. W. West, Solid State Commun. **119**, 641 (2001).
- ³⁵ D. Paget, G. Lampel, B. Sapoval, and V. I. Safarov, Phys. Rev. B **15**, 5780 (1977).
- ³⁶ I. V. Kukushkin, K. v. Klitzing, and K. Eberl, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 3665 (1999).
- ³⁷ S. Melinte, N. Freytag, M. Horvati, C. Berthier, L. P. Lévy, V. Bayot, and M. Shayegan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 354 (2000).