

Generalized partition functions, interpolating statistics and higher virial coefficients

P. F. Borges*, H. Boschi-Filho[†] and C. Farina[‡]

*Instituto de Física, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro
Caixa Postal 68528, Rio de Janeiro 21945-970, RJ, BRAZIL*

March 19, 2018

Abstract

Starting from determinants at finite temperature obeying an intermediate boundary condition between the periodic (bosonic) and antiperiodic (fermionic) cases, we find results which can be mapped onto the ones obtained from anyons for the second virial coefficient. Using this approach, we calculate the corresponding higher virial coefficients and compare them with the results known in the literature.

*E-mail address: pborges@if.ufrj.br

[†]E-mail address: boschi@if.ufrj.br

[‡]E-mail address: farina@if.ufrj.br

In two dimensional space one finds fractional statistics which depends on a continuous parameter defined on an interval where bosons correspond to one end and fermions to the other [1–8]. One of the most striking properties of fractional statistics is the prediction of fractional charge, *i. e.*, noninteger multiples of the fundamental electron charge e , at low energies inside condensed matter differently from quarks which can only be probed at very high energies and are confined to hadrons. In particular, Laughlin explained the essentials of the fractional quantum Hall effect (FQHE) [9, 10] assuming the existence of currents carrying fractional charges $e/3$ inside two dimensional samples, which has been confirmed in very recent experiments [11, 12].

Different formulations of fractional statistics were proposed, among which the most fundamental ones are the anyon formulation based on a quantum mechanical model consisting of charged flux tubes confined to move on a plane [3] and the axiomatic Haldane’s fractional exclusion statistics which is based on very general assumptions on quantum statistical mechanics in arbitrary dimensions [13]. However, these two formulations are not equivalent in general, as it was soon noted by Haldane. One way to see this is to make explicitly calculations, *e. g.*, for the virial coefficients on both formulations and then compare the results. In the case of the exclusion statistics it was shown that for a gas in a low-density expansion only the second virial coefficient depends on the corresponding statistical parameter while the others are exactly equal to the bosonic and fermionic values [14, 15]. On the other side, in the charged flux tube or anyon formulation, the second virial coefficient was found exactly [5] but the higher virial coefficients are not exactly tractable, apart from the fact that the third virial coefficient has an exact mirror symmetry in its dependence on the statistical parameter in respect to its semi-interval [16, 17]. The calculation of higher virial coefficients for anyons have been attacked with the aid of perturbation theory and numerical methods showing that in general, there are corrections with respect to the corresponding bosonic or fermionic values [18–27].

Recently, we introduced a generalized partition function interpolating that ones for free relativistic charged bosons and fermions which we showed to lead, in the nonrelativistic limit, to results which are mapped onto the conventional ones for anyons, in particular for the second virial coefficient [28]. In this letter we are going to use this approach to calculate the corresponding higher virial coefficients. We find that they are all dependent

on the interpolating parameters, so they only coincide with the results from the exclusion statistics for the bosonic and fermionic cases. However, these coefficients are remarkably close to the ones obtained from anyon calculations.

The route that we are going to take here follows Ref. [28] so that we use few but essential information which are necessary for a thermodynamical description of a system whose properties interpolate those corresponding to fermionic and bosonic gases. These informations are: first the (relativistic) particles should obey energy conservation and so despite they are described by some involved specific (say, 2+1 dimensional) equation they should also obey the Klein-Gordon equation. Hence, the corresponding partition function can be written in terms of the determinant of this operator; second, this determinant should be calculated using some appropriate boundary condition; and finally the partition function is defined by a certain power of this determinant. We choose a boundary condition that continuously interpolates the bosonic and fermionic cases. Such a condition, in the Euclidean time compactified to the interval $[0, \beta]$, β being the inverse of temperature, can be written as

$$\psi(0; \vec{x}) = e^{i\theta} \psi(\beta; \vec{x}), \quad (1)$$

where θ is a real continuous parameter. The spatial analog of this condition was discussed before in the study of the vacuum structure in gauge theories [29] and to describe the spatial behavior of anyons in 2+1 dimensions, which acquire an arbitrary phase when turned around each other [1, 3, 7]. In a different context, a similar condition had been used to interpolate continuously between the Euclidean and Minkowski metrics to discuss a possible dynamical origin for Lorentzian spacetime [30, 31]. Note that when $\theta = 0$ the above condition reduces to a periodic (bosonic) boundary condition and if $\theta = \pi$ it becomes an antiperiodic (fermionic) one.

So, we can write a partition function according to these prescriptions as ($\hbar = c = 1$)

$$\mathcal{Z} = \det^\sigma(-D^2 + M^2)_\theta, \quad (2)$$

where $-D^2 + M^2$ is the Klein-Gordon operator and the covariant derivative is defined as $D_\nu = (\partial_0 + i\mu, \partial_i)$, with a shift in its time component due to a nonzero chemical potential μ introduced to describe a finite density of (noninteracting) charged particles of mass M in $(N + 1)$ space-time dimensions. The subscript θ means that the eigenfunctions

of the Klein-Gordon operator satisfy the boundary condition (1). The power σ of the determinant enables us to correctly describe the partition functions for charged bosonic ($\theta = 0$, $\sigma = -1$) and fermionic ($\theta = \pi$, $\sigma = +1$) gases.

The determinant (2) can be exactly calculated, so that the corresponding free energy, $\Omega(\beta, \mu) = -(1/\beta) \ln \mathcal{Z}$, can be written as [28]:

$$\Omega(\beta, \mu) = 2V\sigma \left(\frac{M}{2\pi\beta} \right)^{\frac{N+1}{2}} \sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} \cos(n\theta) \left(e^{n\beta\mu} + e^{-n\beta\mu} \right) \left(\frac{1}{n} \right)^{\frac{N+1}{2}} K_{\frac{N+1}{2}}(n\beta M), \quad (3)$$

where $K_\nu(x)$ is the modified Bessel function of the second kind. If we particularize the parameters σ and θ to the bosonic and fermionic cases we shall find precisely the results known in the literature [32–35].

Let us now restrict our analysis to the particular case of most interest which is the two dimensional ($N = 2$) case in the nonrelativistic limit since this is the context where anyons and their applications appear. The nonrelativistic limit in this situation is taken by imposing the low temperature limit $\beta M \gg 1$, since we are restricting the allowed energies to be much less than the rest energy of the particles. Further, we consider only the particle content of the above free energy, corresponding to the fugacity $z = \exp(\beta\mu)$. So, disregarding the antiparticle content with $z' = \exp(-\beta\mu)$, we find that

$$\Omega(\beta, \mu) = -\frac{V}{\beta} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n(\beta) z^n, \quad (4)$$

where $b_n(\beta)$ are the cluster coefficients:

$$b_n(\beta) = -\frac{\sigma M}{2\pi\beta n^2} \cos(n\theta) \exp(-n\beta M); \quad (\beta M \gg 1). \quad (5)$$

Now, using the standard formulae which relate the virial coefficients a_n with the cluster ones [36, 23] ($a_1 = 1$),

$$a_2 = -\frac{b_2}{(b_1)^2}; \quad (6)$$

$$a_3 = -2\frac{b_3}{(b_1)^3} + 4\frac{(b_2)^2}{(b_1)^4}; \quad (7)$$

$$a_4 = -3\frac{b_4}{(b_1)^4} + 18\frac{b_2 b_3}{(b_1)^5} - 20\frac{(b_2)^3}{(b_1)^6}; \quad (8)$$

$$a_5 = -4\frac{b_5}{(b_1)^5} + \frac{32b_2 b_4 + 18(b_3)^3}{(b_1)^6} - 144\frac{(b_2)^2 b_3}{(b_1)^7} + 112\frac{(b_2)^4}{(b_1)^8}; \quad (9)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
a_6 = & -5 \frac{b_6}{(b_1)^6} + \frac{60b_3b_4 + 50b_2b_5}{(b_1)^7} - \frac{315b_2(b_3)^2 + 280(b_2)^2b_4}{(b_1)^8} \\
& + 1120 \frac{(b_2)^3b_3}{(b_1)^9} - 672 \frac{(b_2)^5}{(b_1)^{10}}
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

and substituting (5) into these relations, we find the virial coefficients corresponding to the generalized partition function (2):

$$a_2 = \frac{\lambda^2}{4\sigma} (1 - \tan^2 \theta); \tag{11}$$

$$a_3 = \frac{\lambda^4}{36\sigma^2} (1 + 6 \tan^2 \theta + 9 \tan^4 \theta); \tag{12}$$

$$a_4 = -\frac{\lambda^6}{16\sigma^3} (\tan^2 \theta + 6 \tan^4 \theta + 5 \tan^6 \theta); \tag{13}$$

$$a_5 = -\frac{\lambda^8}{3600\sigma^4} (1 - 60 \tan^2 \theta - 1170 \tan^4 \theta - 2700 \tan^6 \theta - 1575 \tan^8 \theta); \tag{14}$$

$$a_6 = -\frac{\lambda^{10}}{\sigma^5} \left(\frac{1}{288} \tan^2 \theta + \frac{5}{24} \tan^4 \theta + \frac{145}{144} \tan^6 \theta + \frac{35}{24} \tan^8 \theta + \frac{21}{32} \tan^{10} \theta \right), \tag{15}$$

where $\lambda = \sqrt{2\pi\beta/M}$ is the thermal wavelength in natural units. Higher order coefficients can be analogously calculated, but for the moment the above ones are sufficient.

Before we compare these coefficients with those corresponding to the anyonic formulation, let us first note that a relation between the parameters θ and σ can be found, based on the fact that we do not expect to see any statistical behavior in the one particle partition function $Z_1 = Vb_1$. Once b_1 is given by (5) with $n = 1$, we have to impose that $\sigma \cos \theta = \text{constant}$ in order to satisfy that condition. Then, to reproduce correctly the bosonic and fermionic results we choose

$$\sigma(\theta) = -\cos^{-1} \theta. \tag{16}$$

Using this relation we can rewrite the virial coefficients (11)-(15) for instance, as functions of $\sigma = \sigma(\theta)$:

$$a_2 = \frac{\lambda^2}{4} \left(\frac{2}{\sigma} - \sigma \right); \tag{17}$$

$$a_3 = \frac{\lambda^4}{36} \left(\frac{4}{\sigma^2} - 12 + 9\sigma^2 \right); \tag{18}$$

$$a_4 = \frac{\lambda^6}{16} \left(-\frac{4}{\sigma} + 9\sigma - 5\sigma^3 \right); \tag{19}$$

$$a_5 = \lambda^8 \left(-\frac{1}{225\sigma^4} - \frac{2}{15\sigma^2} + \frac{7}{10} - \sigma^2 + \frac{7}{16}\sigma^4 \right); \quad (20)$$

$$a_6 = \lambda^{10} \left(-\frac{1}{18\sigma^3} + \frac{5}{8\sigma} - \frac{125}{72}\sigma + \frac{175}{96}\sigma^3 - \frac{21}{32}\sigma^5 \right). \quad (21)$$

So, from eqs. (11)-(15) or eqs. (17)-(21) we clearly see that these coefficients are singular for $\theta = (2k + 1)\pi/2$ with k integer or equivalently when $\sigma = 0$. This is not the case of the anyon higher virial coefficients which have been shown using perturbation and numerical methods to be finite to all orders except for the second where cusps are present at the bosonic points [17–27]. However, our coefficients and the usual anyon ones share other interesting properties. First of all, they naturally reproduce the usual bosonic and fermionic virial coefficients when we put $\theta = 0$ and π , respectively, so that

$$a_{2B}^F = \pm \frac{1}{4}\lambda^2; \quad a_3 = \frac{1}{36}\lambda^4; \quad a_4 = 0; \quad a_5 = -\frac{1}{3600}\lambda^8; \quad a_6 = 0; \dots \quad (22)$$

and all coefficients (11)-(15) or equivalently (17)-(21) are periodic functions of θ , as expected. Further, when θ is away from the singularities, *i. e.*, near the bosonic $\theta = 2k\pi$ and fermionic $\theta = (2k + 1)\pi$ points these expressions give good approximations to the higher virial coefficients of anyons in a very simple way, as we are going to show bellow. Near these points we can use the approximation

$$\tan^2 \theta \approx \sin^2 \theta \quad (23)$$

so that we have the approximate coefficients

$$a_2 \simeq \pm \frac{\lambda^2}{4} (1 - \sin^2 \theta); \quad (24)$$

$$a_3 \simeq \frac{\lambda^4}{36} (1 + 6 \sin^2 \theta + 9 \sin^4 \theta); \quad (25)$$

$$a_4 \simeq \mp \frac{\lambda^6}{16} (\sin^2 \theta + 6 \sin^4 \theta + 5 \sin^6 \theta); \quad (26)$$

$$a_5 \simeq -\frac{\lambda^8}{3600} (1 - 60 \sin^2 \theta - 1170 \sin^4 \theta - 2700 \sin^6 \theta - 1575 \sin^8 \theta); \quad (27)$$

$$a_6 \simeq \mp \lambda^{10} \left(\frac{1}{288} \sin^2 \theta + \frac{5}{24} \sin^4 \theta + \frac{145}{144} \sin^6 \theta + \frac{35}{24} \sin^8 \theta + \frac{21}{32} \sin^{10} \theta \right), \quad (28)$$

where the upper signs correspond to fermions and lower to bosons. Note that the odd coefficients have the same global sign for bosons and fermions according to Eqs. (11)-(15).

To establish the relations between these coefficients and those that come from anyons, let us first write the exact result of Arovas, Schrieffer, Wilczek and Zee [5] for the anyon second virial coefficient:

$$A_2 = \frac{\lambda^2}{4}[\pm 1 + (-2 \pm 2)|\alpha| - 2\alpha^2], \quad (29)$$

where upper signs correspond to fermion, lower to boson based anyons and α is the statistical parameter, which is assumed to be a periodic function of another parameter, say an angle θ' .

Higher anyon virial coefficients have been investigated by several authors [17–27] with different approaches. In particular, Dasnières de Veigy and Ouvry [22, 23] using a highly involved perturbation theory were able to find corrections of order α^2 for the anyon coefficients up to the sixth one:

$$A_3 = \lambda^4 \left[\frac{1}{36} + \frac{\alpha^2}{12} \right]; \quad (30)$$

$$\begin{aligned} A_4 &= \frac{\lambda^6 \alpha^2}{16} \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \ln \frac{\sqrt{3}+1}{\sqrt{3}-1} \mp 1 \right] \\ &\simeq \frac{\lambda^6 \alpha^2}{16} \left(\frac{3}{4} \mp 1 \right); \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

$$\begin{aligned} A_5 &= \lambda^8 \left\{ -\frac{1}{3600} + \alpha^2 \left[\frac{1}{36} \mp \left(\frac{1}{6\sqrt{6}} \ln \frac{3+\sqrt{6}}{3-\sqrt{6}} - \frac{1}{6\sqrt{3}} \ln \frac{\sqrt{3}+1}{\sqrt{3}-1} \right) \right] \right\} \\ &\simeq \lambda^8 \left[-\frac{1}{3600} + \alpha^2 \left(\frac{1}{36} \mp \frac{1}{34} \right) \right]; \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

$$\begin{aligned} A_6 &= \lambda^{10} \alpha^2 \left[\mp \frac{5}{576} + \frac{5}{864\sqrt{2}} \ln \frac{\sqrt{2}+1}{\sqrt{2}-1} + \frac{65}{288\sqrt{3}} \ln \frac{\sqrt{3}+1}{\sqrt{3}-1} + \frac{8}{27\sqrt{5}} \ln \frac{\sqrt{5}+1}{\sqrt{5}-1} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{25}{48\sqrt{6}} \ln \frac{3+\sqrt{6}}{3-\sqrt{6}} + \frac{9}{32\sqrt{10}} \ln \frac{4+\sqrt{10}}{4-\sqrt{10}} \right] \\ &\simeq \lambda^{10} \alpha^2 \left(\mp \frac{5}{576} + \frac{1}{102} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

following the same notation used in Eq. (29). Using very precise Monte Carlo calculations these results were later corrected to order α^4 for the third virial coefficient by Maskevich, Myrheim and Olaussem [26]

$$A_3 = \lambda^4 \left[\frac{1}{36} + \frac{\sin^2 \theta'}{12\pi^2} - \frac{\sin^4 \theta'}{(621 \pm 5)\pi^4} \right]; \quad (34)$$

where $\sin \theta' = \pi|\alpha|$, and more recently by Kristofersen *et. al.* to the fourth anyon virial coefficient [27]:

$$A_4 = \lambda^6 \left[\frac{\sin^2 \theta'}{16\pi^2} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \ln(\sqrt{3} + 2) + \cos \theta' \right) + \sin^4 \theta' (c_4 + d_4 \cos \theta') \right], \quad (35)$$

where $c_4 = -0.0053 \pm 0.0003$ and $d_4 = -0.0048 \pm 0.0009$.

Note that there is a small difference between the expressions of A_4 , Eqs. (31) and (35), in respect to the coefficient of term $\sin^2 \theta'$ because of the substitution of ∓ 1 by $\cos \theta'$. This does not modify our analysis since we are considering θ' near π or zero. More generally, it seems to be a basic difference between these two approaches to higher anyon virial coefficients. In numerical simulations one usually works with single smooth functions which do not distinguish the statistics, while in the perturbation theory, as expressed in coefficients A_4 and A_6 , Eqs. (31) and (33), these coefficients are statistics dependent as it happens to the well known Arovas *et. al.* result, Eq. (29).

So, near the fermionic point in our formulation ($\theta \approx \pi$) and imposing the equality between (24) and (29) with fermion signs, we obtain

$$\sin^2 \theta \simeq 2\alpha^2 \simeq \frac{2}{\pi^2} \sin^2 \theta' \quad (36)$$

which shows that our virial coefficients, Eqs. (25)-(28), are very close to the ones coming from anyons, Eqs. (30)-(35). An analogous situation occurs if we start near the bosonic point ($\theta \approx 0$) and we identify

$$\sin^2 \theta \simeq 4|\alpha| - 2\alpha^2 \simeq \frac{4}{\pi} |\sin \theta'| - \frac{2}{\pi^2} \sin^2 \theta' \quad (37)$$

so that similar results are obtained but since the above relation include linear terms in $|\sin \theta'|$ one would also find odd powers of this term in the analysis which did not occur for the coefficients near the fermionic point.

These results are in good qualitative agreement with the perturbative and numerical ones for anyons but quantitatively the numerical factors in our coefficients are greater than those appearing in Refs. [22, 23, 26, 27]. However, it is important to emphasize that the our coefficients have the expected properties like the exact mirror symmetry [17] and also contain the particular fermionic and bosonic cases when we choose appropriately the parameter θ .

Another good test for our coefficients is to compare them with the ones coming from the average field formulation [37–39,8] where anyons are supposed to be a large collection of noninteracting bosons ($\nu = \theta'/\pi$) or fermions ($\nu = \theta'/\pi - 1$) of density ρ in an average magnetic field, $\bar{B} = \nu\rho\Phi_0$, where $\Phi_0 = h/e$ is the elementary quantum flux. In this case, the virial expansion reads

$$\beta P = \rho \pm \frac{1}{4}\lambda^2\rho^2 + \frac{1+3\nu^2}{36}\lambda^4\rho^3 \mp \frac{\nu^2}{16}\lambda^6\rho^4 - \frac{1-100\nu^2+5\nu^4}{3600}\lambda^8\rho^5 + \dots \quad (38)$$

Our results (24)-(28) are remarkably close to these ones, suggesting that our results may be an intermediary formulation between the conventional ones for anyons and the average field approach.

We can go even further in the calculation of higher virial coefficients within our approach since we already found the cluster coefficients exactly. For simplicity, we just present the basic behavior of the n -th virial coefficient:

$$a_n = (1-n)\frac{b_n}{(b_1)^n} + \sum_i c_i^n \prod_j^{n-1} (a_j)^{d_i^n}, \quad (39)$$

where c_i^n and d_i^n are well known constants that can be determined from standard Eqs. (6)-(10) and so on. Using eq. (5) one finds

$$a_n = \left(-\frac{\cos\theta\lambda^2}{2n}\right)^{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n k_i^n \tan^{2i-2}\theta, \quad (40)$$

where the constants k_i^n can be determined from Eqs. (6)-(10)..., combined with (5). In particular, $(-1/2n)^{n-1}k_1^n$ are identified with the Bernoulli numbers. Note that these polynomials in $\tan^2\theta$ with even $n > 2$ vanish for $\theta = 0$ and π , reproducing correctly the usual bosonic and fermionic virial coefficients in two dimensions.

It is the hope of the authors that the higher virial coefficients presented here, which interpolate the bosonic and fermionic cases, can perhaps shed some light on the thermodynamics of fractional statistics. It should be remarked that we discussed here the free case only. However, in more realistic models one should take into account the coupling between the particles and/or the interaction with external fields. Another point of interest is the possibility of connection of these results with a more fundamental theory starting from a Lagrangian density with bosonic or fermionic fields coupled to a Chern- Simons term at finite temperature to see if the quasiperiodic conditions would come directly from

the gauge symmetry of the problem. The discussion of these points are presently under investigation and will be reported elsewhere. Let us also mention that our approach is independent of the space-time dimension, as it happens in Haldane's exclusion statistics, although here we discussed the particular case of $N = 2$ in more detail to stress its relations with the anyon formulation on the basis of the virial expansion. Within this context, it might be interesting to discuss the relation of our approach with systems in other dimensions, *e. g.*, the one-dimensional cases presenting exotic statistics.

H.B.-F. thanks D. Bazeia for reading a preliminary version of the manuscript and for useful suggestions on it, and the hospitality of the Center for Theoretical Physics, MIT where part of this work was done. The authors H.B.-F. and C.F. were partially supported by CNPq (Brazilian agency).

References

- [1] J.H. Leinaas and J. Myrheim, *Nuovo Cimento B* **37**, 1 (1977).
- [2] G. A. Goldin, R. Menikoff and D. H. Sharp, *J. Math. Phys.* **21**, 650 (1980); **22**, 1664 (1981); *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **51**, 2246 (1983).
- [3] F. Wilczek, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **48**, 1144 (1982); **49**, 9557 (1982).
- [4] Y. S. Wu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **52**, 2103 (1984).
- [5] D. P. Arovas, R. Schrieffer, F. Wilczek and A. Zee, *Nucl. Phys. B* **251**, 117 (1985).
- [6] J. Dowker, *J. Phys. A* **18**, 3521 (1985).
- [7] R. Jackiw, *Annals of Physics* **201**, 83 (1990).
- [8] For a review see F. Wilczek, *Fractional Statistics and Anyon Superconductivity*, World Scientific, Singapore (1990).
- [9] R. B. Laughlin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **50**, 1395 (1983).
- [10] For a review see R. E. Prange and S. M. Girvin, *The Quantum Hall Effect*, Springer, N.Y. (1987).
- [11] R. de Picciotto *et. al.*, *Nature* **389**, 162 (1997).
- [12] L. Saminadayar, D. C. Glattli, Y. Jin and B. Etienne, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 2526 (1997).
- [13] F. D. M. Haldane, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 937 (1991).
- [14] M. V. N. Murthy and R. Shankar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **72**, 3629 (1994).
- [15] S. B. Isakov, D. P. Arovas, J. Myrheim and A. P. Ploychronakos, *Phys. Lett. A* **212**, 299 (1996).
- [16] R. K. Bhaduri, R. S. Bhalerao, A. Khare, J. Law and M. V. N. Murthy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **66**, 523 (1991).

- [17] D. Sen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 2977 (1992).
- [18] J. McCabe and S. Ouvry, Phys. Lett. B **260**, 113 (1991).
- [19] A. Comtet, J. McCabe and S. Ouvry, Phys. Lett. B **260**, 372 (1991).
- [20] D. Sen, Nucl. Phys. B **360**, 397 (1991).
- [21] G. V. Dune, A. Lerda, S. Sciuto and C. A. Trugenberger, Phys. Lett. B **277**, 474 (1992).
- [22] A. Dasnières de Veigy and S. Ouvry, Phys. Lett. B **291**, 130 (1992).
- [23] A. Dasnières de Veigy and S. Ouvry, Nucl. Phys. B **388**, 715 (1992).
- [24] J. Myrheim and K. Olaussem, Phys. Lett. B **299**, 267 (1993); *Erratum* **305**, 428 (1993).
- [25] M. Sporre, J. J. M. Verbaarschot and I. Zahed, Nucl. Phys. B **389**, 645 (1993).
- [26] S. Maskevich, J. Myrheim and K. Olaussem, Phys. Lett. B **382**, 124 (1996).
- [27] A. Kristoffersen, S. Maskevich, J. Myrheim and K. Olaussem, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **13**, 3723 (1998).
- [28] P. Borges, H. Boschi-Filho and C. Farina, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **13**, 843 (1998).
- [29] K. D. Rothe and J. A. Swieca, Nucl. Phys. B **138**, 26 (1978).
- [30] J. Greensite, Phys. Lett. B **300**, 34 (1993).
- [31] A. Carlini and J. Greensite, Phys. Rev. D **49**, 866 (1994).
- [32] H. E. Haber and H. A. Weldon, Phys. Rev. Lett. **46**, 1497 (1981).
- [33] J. I. Kapusta, Phys. Rev. D **24**, 426 (1981).
- [34] A. Actor, Phys. Lett. B **157**, 53 (1985).
- [35] For a review see J. I. Kapusta, *Finite temperature field theory*, Cambridge, UK (1989).

- [36] See, e. g., K. Huang, *Statistical Mechanics*, Wiley, N.Y. (1963). Note that here we are using a different notation, in which $b_1 \neq 1$.
- [37] R. B. Laughlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 2677 (1988).
- [38] A. L. Fetter, C. B. Hanna and R. B. Laughlin, Phys. Rev. B **39**, 9679 (1989).
- [39] Y.-H. Chen, F. Wilczek, E. Witten and B. I. Halperin, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **3**, 1001 (1989).