

Analytic wave functions for neutral bulk excitations in fractional quantum Hall fluids

Bo Yang

Department of Physics, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey 08544, USA

(Received 1 April 2013; revised manuscript received 6 June 2013; published 27 June 2013)

We show the model wave functions for the neutral collective modes in fractional quantum Hall (FQH) states have simple analytic forms obtained from judiciously reducing the powers of selected pairs in the ground state Jastrow factor. This scheme of “pair excitations” works for the magnetoroton modes of single-component Abelian and non-Abelian FQH states, as well as the neutral fermion mode for the Moore-Read state. The analytic wave functions allow us to compute the “quadrupole gap” of the magnetoroton mode in the thermodynamic limit, which was previously inaccessible to the numerics. The quadrupole gap is related to the fusion of the charges in the two-dimensional plasma picture, extending the plasma analogy to neutral excitations. A lattice diagrammatic method of representing these many-body wave functions and FQH elementary excitations is also presented.

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevB.87.245132](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.87.245132)

PACS number(s): 73.43.Cd, 73.43.Lp

I. INTRODUCTION

The fractional quantum Hall effect (FQHE)¹ is one of the prime examples where the strong interaction between electrons dictates the dynamics. A very fruitful approach for such a strongly correlated system is to look for model wave functions and model Hamiltonians that are adiabatically connected to experimentally accessible systems. For the ground states and charged excitations of FQHE at several filling factors, wave functions have compact analytic forms.²⁻⁴ We can thus infer the properties of FQHE in the thermodynamic limit by reinterpreting the wave functions in analogy to two-dimensional plasmas,² or as conformal blocks of some special conformal field theories (CFT).^{3,5} In general for these approaches, incompressibility of FQHE is always assumed, and the dynamics of the bulk gapped excitations is not explicitly addressed.

Incompressibility of FQHE is defined by the neutral bulk collective excitations. Such excitations are important for understanding which topological phases of the FQHE can be stabilized, and are also very relevant to the recent development in fractional Chern insulator, where the issue of incompressibility and its mapping to the FQHE⁶⁻¹² are areas of active research. The first formal treatment of the neutral excitations came from the single mode approximation (SMA) for the magnetoroton¹³ mode, where good model wave functions of density wave excitations can be constructed numerically up to the momentum of roton minimum, beyond which SMA is no longer valid.¹⁴ Following the experimental studies of the neutral excitations by several groups,¹⁵⁻¹⁹ more recently the model wave functions are constructed numerically both for the magnetoroton modes in the Read-Rezayi (RR) series, and the neutral fermion mode²⁰ in the Moore-Read (MR) state, the latter reflecting its non-Abelian nature. One approach in constructing the model wave functions is to treat the neutral excitations as excitons of the composite fermions.²¹⁻²³ Another approach is to apply the formalism of Jack polynomials²⁴ with appropriate root configurations and clustering properties.^{14,25} These wave functions are in principle good for the entire range of momenta. In practice, however, the long wavelength limit is not accessible due to the limitation by the system size. Interestingly, even though the underlying phenomenological

pictures of the neutral excitations can be different, it is found numerically that both approaches mentioned above produce exactly the same set of model wave functions with very rich algebraic structures. Just like the ground states and bulk charged excitations of many FQH fluids, where model wave functions have natural forms with no variational parameters, in this paper we show how the model wave functions for the bulk neutral excitations can be formulated analytically, thereby unifying previous numerical works on this issue.

This paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II the model wave functions for both the magnetoroton mode and the neutral fermion mode are constructed explicitly, generalizing the Jastrow factor in the Laughlin wave function both at odd and even filling. In Sec. III a diagrammatic scheme is introduced to represent the bulk neutral many-body wave functions in an intuitive way, which also shed light on the way these neutral excitations can be interpreted as “elementary excitations” of the FQH fluid. In Sec. IV the compact analytic form of the model wave functions is exploited to calculate the thermodynamic energy gap of the neutral excitations in the long wavelength limit, which lies in the region inaccessible to numerical calculation. This also leads to an interesting connection of the FQHE bulk dynamics to the free energy cost of particle fusion in the plasma analogy. Section V gives the conclusion and discussion of the paper.

II. WAVE FUNCTION CONSTRUCTION

Previous works on the numerical generation of the neutral excitation model wave functions are done mostly on spherical geometry, where only gapped bulk excitations are present for the incompressible phases. The bulk neutral excitations are also present on disk geometry, though the spectrum is more complicated due to the presence of edge excitations (more comments on it in Sec. V). In the thermodynamic limit the bulk excitations should be insensitive to the geometry of the Hall manifold. In fact, even for finite systems, we can go to the “conformal limit”²⁶ on either spherical or disk geometry, by removing the single particle wave function normalization constant from the many-body wave functions; the resulting model wave functions are identical. For example, the Laughlin

wave function of the two fermions at filling factor $\nu = 1/3$ on the sphere is given by $\psi_s = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|1001\rangle - |0110\rangle)$, and on the disk it is given by $\psi_d = \frac{1}{2}(|1001\rangle - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}|0110\rangle)$. The string of binary numbers represents the orbital basis,¹⁴ where the 1s denote occupied orbitals and 0s denote unoccupied orbitals. On the sphere, the leftmost orbital is at the north pole, and the rightmost orbital is at the south pole; on the disk, the leftmost orbital is at the center of the disk, while the rightmost orbital is at the edge. For two electrons, the proper number of orbitals is *four* to account for the shift on the sphere.²⁷ When the single particle normalization is removed, both wave functions lead to the familiar Laughlin wave function in the conformal limit $\psi_c = |1001\rangle - 3|0110\rangle$, where the coefficient of the root configuration $|1001\rangle$ is normalized to unity. It is thus convenient to unambiguously rewrite the wave function with the un-normalized single particle wave function on the disk in the lowest Landau level (LLL), where the n th orbital is given by z_i^{n-1} (the Gaussian factor is omitted since it does not play any role here for FQHE), with holomorphic variables $z_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}l_B}(x_i + iy_i)$. Here x_i and y_i are the coordinates in the Hall manifold, $l_B = \sqrt{\hbar/eB}$ is the magnetic length, and i is the particle index. Explicitly we have

$$|1001\rangle \sim z_1^3 - z_2^3, \quad |0110\rangle \sim z_1 z_2^2 - z_1^2 z_2, \quad (1)$$

and $\psi_c = (z_1 - z_2)^3$.

Having identified the relationship between many-body wave functions on different geometries, in this paper all analytic wave functions are presented as polynomials of z_i . Thus in principle these model wave functions are for neutral excitations on the disk, but they can be easily converted into model wave functions on the sphere by multiplying appropriate spherical single particle normalization factors. In particular, after the conversion the model wave functions in this paper are *identical* to those generated numerically in Refs. 14,21–23. On the disk each model wave function is labeled by its total angular momentum about the z axis perpendicular to the disk, i.e., δL_z , measured from the ground state (with the ground state having $\delta L_z = 0$). The neutral excitations are states with negative $\delta L_z = -N$ (states with positive δL_z contain gapless edge excitations). When the highest weight condition is imposed,²⁸ these states correspond to the highest weight state on the sphere in the total angular momentum sector $L = N$, with all the quasiparticles piled at the north pole.¹⁴ Since the mapping from the disk wave functions to the sphere wave functions is unambiguous, in this paper all model wave functions are labeled by L instead of δL_z , to facilitate comparison with numerical works on the spherical geometry in the literature.

On the sphere the ground state is the Laughlin wave function in the total angular momentum $L = 0$ sector. The corresponding model Hamiltonian on the disk made of Haldane pseudopotentials²⁹ is given by $V = \sum_{i < j} V_{ij}$, with

$$V_{ij} = \int \frac{d^2 q}{2\pi} l_B^2 \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} L_n(q^2 l_B^2) e^{-\frac{1}{2} q^2 l_B^2} e^{i\vec{q} \cdot (\vec{R}_i - \vec{R}_j)}, \quad (2)$$

where $L_n(x)$ is the n th Laguerre polynomial and \vec{R}_i is the guiding center coordinate of the i th particle. Physically, V_{ij}

is the short range interaction that projects into the two-body Hilbert space with the relative angular momentum smaller than m .

We now present the wave functions of the neutral excitations for the fermionic Laughlin state at filling factor $\nu = 1/m$ in the lowest Landau level (LLL), where m is odd. The family of the neutral excitations at different angular momentum sectors is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A} \left[(z_1 - z_2)^{m-2} \prod'_{i < j} (z_i - z_j)^m \right], \quad L = 2, \\ \mathcal{A} \left[(z_1 - z_2)^{m-2} (z_1 - z_3)^{m-1} \prod'_{i < j} (z_i - z_j)^m \right], \quad L = 3, \quad (3) \\ \mathcal{A} \left[(z_1 - z_2)^{m-2} (z_1 - z_3)^{m-1} (z_1 - z_4)^{m-1} \prod'_{i < j} (z_i - z_j)^m \right], \\ L = 4, \\ \vdots \end{aligned}$$

Here \mathcal{A} indicates antisymmetrization over all particle indices, and the prime sign on $\prod'_{i < j}$ indicates the product of only pairs $\{ij\}$ that do not appear in the prefactors to the left of it. For example, in Eq. (3) the product in the $L = 2$ wave function does not contain $(z_1 - z_2)^m$.

An explanation of Eq. (3) is in order here. The $L = 2$ state, which is the quadrupole excitation in the thermodynamic limit,¹⁴ is obtained from the ground state by reducing the power of one pair of particles (which we can choose arbitrarily as particle 1 and 2 because of antisymmetrization) by *two*, followed by antisymmetrizing over all particles. This scheme naturally forbids an $L = 1$ state by the pair excitation, since if we reduce the power of one pair of particles by *one*, antisymmetrization kills the state. The $L = 3$ state is generated by pairing particle 1 with another particle (which we can arbitrarily choose as particle 3) and reducing their pair power by one. It is now clear how the modes in other momentum sectors $L = 4, 5, \dots$ are generated. Naturally for a total of N_e particles, the family of neutral excitation modes ends at $L = N_e$, agreeing with the numerical schemes in the literature. We have numerically checked for different system sizes that all wave functions in Eq. (3) agree exactly with those generated in Refs. 14,21–23. Indeed, all wave functions here satisfy the highest weight condition, and the states relax to the ground state far away from the excited pairs; these are exactly the conditions we used to numerically generate the unique model wave function in each momentum sector.¹⁴

The same scheme applies to the MR state. It is instructive to first see how the MR ground state is obtained. The Laughlin wave function at half filling is given by the Jack polynomial²⁴ $J_{1010101\dots}^{-2}(z_i) = \prod_{i < j} (z_i - z_j)^2$. For fermions this is not a valid state; instead the ground state was constructed by a pairing mechanism,³ which is also a Jack polynomial $J_{1100110011\dots}^{-3}$. Explicitly in the wave function, the pairing reduces the power of each pair of particles by *one*. For $2n$ particles, the antisymmetrization reproduces the Pfaffian up to a constant as

follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Pf} \left(\frac{1}{z_i - z_j} \right) \prod_{i < j} (z_i - z_j)^2 \\ & \sim \mathcal{A} \left[(z_1 - z_2)(z_3 - z_4) \cdots (z_{2n-1} - z_{2n}) \prod'_{i < j} (z_i - z_j)^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Again the prime sign in the second line indicates products of only pairs $\{i,j\}$ other than $\{1,2\}, \{3,4\}, \dots, \{2n-1, 2n\}$ appearing in the prefactor. The explicit use of antisymmetrization instead of the Pfaffian allows us to naturally extend to the case with an odd number of particles: starting from the bosonic Laughlin wave function at half filling, every two particles form a pair except for just one particle. Naturally the “ground state” of the neutral fermion mode is given by

$$\mathcal{A} \left[(z_1 - z_2)(z_3 - z_4) \cdots (z_{2n-1} - z_{2n}) \prod'_{i < j} (z_i - z_j)^2 \right]. \quad (5)$$

Note both i, j in $\prod'_{i < j}$ runs from 1 up to $2n + 1$, with pairs appearing before $\prod'_{i < j}$ excluded. Though we can no longer represent Eq. (5) as a Pfaffian, comparing the antisymmetrized products we can see Eq. (5) is really the same as that of Eq. (4), only with an odd number of particles. For the model three-body Hamiltonian, this is a zero-energy Abelian quasihole state $J_{1100110011\dots 0011001}^{-3}$ in the angular momentum sector $L = \frac{1}{2}(N_e - 1)$. The magnetoroton mode and the neutral fermion mode are obtained from Eq. (4) and Eq. (5), respectively, by reducing the powers in the Jastrow factor the same way as what is done for the Laughlin state.

To write down all the analytic wave functions shown above in a more formal way, we define $\mathcal{P}_{ij} = \frac{1}{z_i - z_j}$. Notice the Pfaffian for $2n$ particles can be written as $\text{Pf} \left(\frac{1}{z_i - z_j} \right) \sim \mathcal{A}[\mathcal{P}^{(2n)}]$, where $\mathcal{P}^{(2n)} = \mathcal{P}_{12}\mathcal{P}_{34} \cdots \mathcal{P}_{2n-1, 2n}$. The magnetoroton mode for the Laughlin state in the $L = k + 2$ sector is given by

$$\psi_l^{L=k+2} = \prod_{i < j}^{N_e} (z_i - z_j)^m \mathcal{S}[\mathcal{P}_{12}^2 \mathcal{P}_{13} \cdots \mathcal{P}_{1, 2+k}], \quad (6)$$

where \mathcal{S} is the symmetrization over all the particle indices. From the bosonic Laughlin wave function at filling factor $1/2$ we can impose pairing to obtain

$$\psi_{\text{mr}} = \prod_{i < j}^{N_e} (z_i - z_j)^2 \mathcal{A}[\mathcal{P}^{(2n)}]. \quad (7)$$

For an even number of electrons we have $N_e = 2n$ and Eq. (7) is the MR ground state. The magnetoroton mode for the MR state in the $L = k + 2$ sector is given by

$$\psi_{\text{mr}}^{L=k+2} = \prod_{i < j}^{N_e} (z_i - z_j)^2 \mathcal{A}[\mathcal{P}^{(2n)} \mathcal{P}_{13}^2 \mathcal{P}_{15} \cdots \mathcal{P}_{1, 3+2k}]. \quad (8)$$

For an odd number of electrons we have $N_e = 2n + 1$ and Eq. (7) is the MR quasihole state of Eq. (5). The neutral fermion




FIG. 1. For N_e particles, the lattice can be viewed as an N -gon, with three bonds connecting every pair of vertices.

mode in the $L = 3/2 + k$ sector is given by

$$\psi_{\text{mr}}^{L=\frac{3}{2}+k} = \prod_{i < j}^{N_e} (z_i - z_j)^2 \mathcal{A}[\mathcal{P}^{(2n)} \mathcal{P}_{N_e, 1}^2 \mathcal{P}_{N_e, 3} \cdots \mathcal{P}_{N_e, 1+2k}]. \quad (9)$$

All the model wave functions shown so far satisfy the highest weight condition. On the disk these states describe neutral systems with no center of mass rotation, of which the ground states are just special cases with no symmetrized/antisymmetrized singular factors multiplying to the Jastrow factor.

III. DIAGRAMMATIC REPRESENTATION

An intuitive way to visualize the family of neutral excitations is to map the particles onto a lattice, where each lattice site represents a particle. Since for FQHE we have a quantum fluid instead of a solid, every two lattice sites interact with each other. The number of bonds between each pair of lattice sites is equal to the power of the pair of particles in the wave function. As an example we consider the simplest Laughlin state at $\nu = 1/3$, so for the ground state every two lattice sites are connected by three bonds, as shown in Fig. 1.

The neutral excitations are obtained by breaking the bonds between lattice sites, as shown in Fig. 2. We can view the entire family of the neutral excitations as the elementary excitations centered around a single red lattice site. Note the lattice pattern uniquely defines the many-body wave function, and different types of “elementary excitations” can be identified with different patterns of bond breaking around a single lattice site with the red color (and also circled).

The neutral excitations in the MR states can be represented similarly. For the MR ground state with even number of




FIG. 2. (Color online) Collective modes from $L = 2$ to $L = 5$, where the change of bonds are highlighted with red color and the involved lattice site is circled.




FIG. 3. (Color online) Lattice configuration of the ground state $L = 0$ and the first collective mode $L = 2$. Consecutive collective modes can be obtained by breaking one of the *double bonds* connecting the red (circled) lattice site to some other site.

particles, every paired particle corresponds to a pair of lattice sites with only one bond connecting them. This can be seen in the first line of Eq. (4), as the paired coordinates only have power 1 in the Jastrow factor. All other pairs of lattice sites have two bonds connecting them (see the left diagram of Fig. 3, where only four sites are explicitly shown). For an odd number of particles, the zero-energy quasihole state is obtained from the MR ground state lattice by adding one more lattice site that connects every other lattice site with two bonds [see the first line of Eq. (5), and the top diagram of Fig. 4].

The lattice representations of the magnetoroton modes for the MR state are given in Fig. 3 and those of the neutral fermion mode are given in Fig. 4.

The lattice diagrams give a one-to-one mapping to the many-body wave functions; one would also conjecture the diagrams are useful in determining the many-body wave functions of multiroton excitations, with the same bond-breaking pattern around more than one lattice site. One should note, however, the different many-body wave functions corresponding to different lattice diagrams *may not* be linearly independent, and this is a subject requiring further research.




FIG. 4. (Color online) Lattice configuration of the zero mode quasihole state $L = \frac{1}{2}(N_e - 1)$ and the first two neutral fermion modes at $L = \frac{3}{2}$ and $L = \frac{5}{2}$. Consecutive collective modes can be obtained by breaking one of the *double bonds* connecting the red lattice site to some other site.

All the wave functions presented in this paper are linearly independent because they are in different angular momentum sectors.

IV. ENERGY GAP OF QUADRUPOLE EXCITATIONS

For systems with a finite number of particles, the analytic wave functions presented in the previous two sections do not seem to be advantageous in calculating either the density profile or the variational energy, unless there is an ingenious way of implementing Monte Carlo techniques based on the explicit analytic form. In the thermodynamic limit where the number of particles $N_e \rightarrow \infty$, the spherical and disk geometry are equivalent, at least as far as the bulk neutral excitations are concerned. One can convert the total angular momentum L of a state on the sphere to the linear momentum k on the disk by $k = L/\sqrt{S}$, where S is the monopole strength at the center of sphere.²⁹ In the thermodynamic limit $S \rightarrow \infty$. Thus any state of finite L on the sphere corresponds to a state with linear momentum $k \rightarrow 0$ on the plane, when we take the limit $N_e \rightarrow \infty$. In this way, the analytic wave functions are useful in calculating the thermodynamic neutral excitation gap in the long wavelength limit, or the so-called “quadrupole gap.” Writing $\psi_l^{L=N} = \langle z_1, \dots, z_{N_e} | \psi_l^{L=N} \rangle$, for the Laughlin state, the energy gap is given by

$$\epsilon_{k \rightarrow 0} = \lim_{N_e \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\langle \psi_l^{L=N} | V | \psi_l^{L=N} \rangle}{\langle \psi_l^{L=N} | \psi_l^{L=N} \rangle}. \quad (10)$$

Physical arguments above lead to the conjecture that Eq. (10) is independent of N , and it would be nice to see a rigorous mathematical proof. We already know¹⁴ that in the $L = 2$ and $L = 3$ sector, the single mode approximation (SMA), which generates model wave functions via density wave excitations, is exact for the magnetoroton model wave functions on the sphere. Thus in the thermodynamic limit, the analytic wave functions on the disk labeled by $L = 2, 3$ are also identical to those generated by SMA in the limit $k \rightarrow 0$. It is thus easiest to evaluate Eq. (10) in the sector $L = 2$. Defining the guiding center ladder operators as $b_i^\dagger = z_i, b_i = \partial_{z_i}$, and denoting the Laughlin wave function as $\psi_l = \prod_{i < j} (z_i - z_j)^m$, we have

$$\psi_l^{L=2} = \frac{1}{2m(m-1)} \sum_i (b_i)^2 \psi_l. \quad (11)$$

In the thermodynamic limit, the normalization constant of the $L = 2$ mode (and also for $L = 3$ mode) is thus related to the long wavelength expansion of the ground state guiding center structure factor:

$$\begin{aligned} S_q &= \frac{1}{N_\phi} (\langle \delta \bar{\rho}_q \delta \bar{\rho}_{-q} \rangle_0 - \langle \delta \bar{\rho}_q \rangle_0 \langle \delta \bar{\rho}_{-q} \rangle_0) \\ &= -\frac{\bar{s}}{4m} (g^{ab} q_a q_b)^2 + O(q^6), \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where $\bar{s} = \frac{1-m}{2}$ is the guiding center spin^{13,29} and g^{ab} is the guiding center metric.³⁰ We thus have

$$\langle \psi_l^{L=2} | \psi_l^{L=2} \rangle = -\frac{\bar{s} N_e}{2m^2(m-1)^2}. \quad (13)$$

The numerator of Eq. (10) can be calculated with the plasma analogy. Note in Eq. (3) each wave function only has one pair

of particles with relative angular momentum smaller than m . After antisymmetrization all particle indices are equivalent, so we only need to look at the action of V_{12} on $\bar{\psi}_l^{\{12\}}$ with

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle z_1, \dots, z_{N_e} | \bar{\psi}_l^{\{12\}} \rangle \\ &= (z_1 - z_2)^{m-2} \prod_{2 < i}^{N_e} (z_1 - z_i)^m (z_2 - z_i)^m \prod_{2 < i < j}^{N_e} (z_i - z_j)^m, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

which is equivalent to the product within the antisymmetrization of the $L = 2$ wave function in Eq. (3). Writing $\bar{z}_{12} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(z_1 + z_2)$, $z_{12} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(z_1 - z_2)$, with some simple algebra we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle z_1, \dots, z_{N_e} | V_{12} | \bar{\psi}_l^{\{12\}} \rangle \\ &= z_{12} \prod_{2 < i}^{N_e} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \bar{z}_{12} - z_i \right)^{2m} \prod_{2 < i < j}^{N_e} (z_i - z_j)^m. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Treating z_{12} and \bar{z}_{12} as independent particle variables, we can integrate out z_{12} and the numerator of Eq. (10) is given by

$$\langle \psi_l^{L=2} | V | \psi_l^{L=2} \rangle = \frac{N_e(N_e - 1) \bar{\mathcal{N}}^2}{2 \mathcal{N}^2}, \quad (16)$$

where \mathcal{N} is the normalization constant of the Laughlin state ψ_l and $\bar{\mathcal{N}}$ is the norm of the following wave function:

$$\bar{\psi} = \prod_{i=2}^{N_e-1} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} z_1 - z_i \right)^{2m} \prod_{1 < i < j < N_e-1} (z_i - z_j)^m \quad (17)$$

obtained from Eq. (15), which can be evaluated as the free energy of two-dimensional one-component plasma (OCP) on a disk with radius $R^2 = \frac{mN_e}{2}$ and elementary charge $e = 2\sqrt{\pi m k_B T}$, where particle 1 interacts with the rest of the particles with charge $2e$. We thus obtain

$$\epsilon_{k \rightarrow 0} = -\frac{2^m m(m-1)^2}{\pi \bar{s}} e^{-\frac{\mathcal{F}_2 - \mathcal{F}}{k_B T}}. \quad (18)$$

Both \mathcal{F}_2 and \mathcal{F} are the free energies of OCP in the thermodynamic limit ($N_e \rightarrow \infty$), where \mathcal{F} is for N_e particles, each with charge e with logarithmic two-body interactions together with a neutralizing background of radius R ; for \mathcal{F}_2 , we have the same neutralizing background, but with $N_e - 2$ particles of charge e , and exactly one particle with charge $2e$. Thus $\mathcal{F}_2 - \mathcal{F}$ is the free energy cost of fusing two particles of charge e to create a particle of charge $2e$, which is an $O(1)$ effect. The denominator is proportional to \bar{s} , which is negative by convention and it determines the overall strength of the quadrupole gap. Note for integer QH $\bar{s} = 0$, and the quadrupole gap goes to infinity. This should be the case since the guiding center degrees of freedom are frozen out.

Similar calculations can be carried out for the magnetoroton mode in the MR state. Analogous to Eq. (11) we have $\psi_{mr}^{L=2} = \frac{1}{24} \sum_i b_i^2 \psi_{mr}$, and in the long wavelength limit we have

$$\epsilon_{k \rightarrow 0}^{mr} = -\frac{24}{\pi \bar{s}_{mr}} e^{-\frac{\mathcal{F}_3 - \mathcal{F}_{II}}{k_B T}}, \quad (19)$$

where $\bar{s}_{mr} = -2$ is the guiding center spin for the MR state, and \mathcal{F}_{II} is the standard two-component plasma free energy for

the MR ground state.⁵ The charge for the attractive interaction between the two components is given by $Q_1 = \pm\sqrt{3k_B T}$, while the charge for the interaction between one component and the neutralizing background is given by $Q_2 = 2\sqrt{k_B T}$. $\mathcal{F}_3 - \mathcal{F}_{II}$ is the free energy cost of fusing *three particles* for each component to create one particle with charge $3Q_2$ but with the same $\pm Q_1$.

The evaluation of the long wavelength gap of the neutral fermion mode is less transparent. The difficulty lies with evaluating the normalization constant of $\psi_{mr}^{L=\frac{3}{2}}$. There is no known SMA analogy for the neutral fermion mode, and it is not known if in the thermodynamic limit the gap should be inversely proportional to the guiding center spin. On the other hand, $\langle \psi_{mr}^{L=\frac{3}{2}} | V_{3\text{bdy}} | \psi_{mr}^{L=\frac{3}{2}} \rangle$ can be mapped to a two-component plasma as well, and we obtain

$$\bar{\epsilon}_{k \rightarrow 0}^{mr} \sim e^{-\frac{\bar{\mathcal{F}}_3 - \bar{\mathcal{F}}_{II}}{k_B T}}. \quad (20)$$

Here $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{II}$ is the free energy of the two-component plasma similar to that of \mathcal{F}_{II} with only one difference: there is exactly one *more* particle carrying charge Q_2 that interacts with the neutralizing background, and its Q_1 charge is zero. This is how an unpaired fermion in the MR state is interpreted in the plasma analogy. Furthermore, $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_3 - \bar{\mathcal{F}}_{II}$ is the energy cost of fusing the unpaired fermion with one pair of two other fermions, creating a particle with charge $Q_2 = 6\sqrt{k_B T}$ but again with zero Q_1 . The calculation of the prefactor in Eq. (20) is not yet known.

V. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

In conclusion, analytic wave functions for both the magnetoroton modes and the neutral fermion modes are presented. The energy gap of the quadrupole excitation in the thermodynamic limit can be related to the free energy cost of the fusion of charges in the plasma energy, and is inversely proportional to the guiding center spin which characterizes its topological order. We have extended the plasma analogy to neutral excitations of FQHE, and the analogy not only applies to the wave functions, but also to the dynamics as well. Since the neutral excitations in the long wavelength limit are buried in the multiroton continuum, it is important to calculate the decay rate of these neutral modes. Numerical calculation has been performed to show that even in the continuum the decay rate of the collective mode is very small. This opens up the possibility of experimental detection of these modes. A more detailed analysis of the decay rate of collective neutral modes will be presented elsewhere.³¹

The neutral excitations in the single component FQHE can now be understood in several coherent frameworks, at least for the Laughlin and Moore-Read states, with possible generalization to the entire Read-Rezayi series. The composite fermion picture maps FQHE to the IQHE of the particle-vortex composite, and in this framework the neutral excitations are excitons of composite fermions. The Jack polynomial formalism enables us to describe the wave functions of the ground states, the quasihole and quasiparticle states, as well as the neutral excitations in a unified way with root configurations and squeezed basis constrained by the clustering properties. It is now satisfactory to see that compact analytic real space

wave functions in electron coordinates, which initiated the theoretical understandings of FQHE, can now be extended from ground states and charged bulk excitations to include neutral bulk excitations. Some questions still remain on if the neutral excitations proposed so far completely describe the energy spectrum of FQHE. Experimental measurements on the Laughlin state¹⁹ suggest a splitting of the collective modes in the long wavelength limit, with theoretical explanations proposed from a hydrodynamic point of view³² and the composite fermion point of view.³³ It would be interesting to see if the lattice diagram introduced in Sec. III can be generalized to produce suitable analytic wave functions that describe multiroton excitations and the splitting of the collective modes as well.

It is well known in the literature that the wave functions of the gapless edge excitations on the disk can be obtained by multiplying the ground state with symmetric polynomials. With model Hamiltonians these are the zero energy states in the positive δL_z angular momentum sectors.^{34,35} For the Moore-Read state, in addition to the charge sector generated by the symmetric polynomials, there are also edge excitations obtained from the statistical sectors via inserting Majorana fermions.³⁶ The analytic wave functions of these states are

known explicitly. One can also generate wave functions by similar operations not only on the ground state, but also on the bulk neutral excitations obtained in this paper. These wave functions describe states such that each contains both bulk and edge excitations. We call these roton-edge excitations, which explain the gapped low-lying multitude of states below the multiroton gap in disk geometry. Recent studies show³⁷ that for the Laughlin state, each bulk neutral excitation generates a branch of quasidegenerate roton-edge excitations with the same Virasoro counting as the zero-energy edge states. For the Moore-Read state, however, the counting of the roton-edge states seem different because of the lack of the linear independence between states in the same momentum sector, possibly due to the non-Abelian nature of the FQH fluid.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank F. D. M. Haldane for many useful discussions, and Zlatko Papić for help in doing numerical evaluations. I also thank Chris Laumann for useful discussions and pointing me to the work of Ref. 5. This work was supported by DOE Grant No. DE-SC0002140 and NSS Scholarship by ASTAR.

-
- ¹D. C. Tsui, H. L. Stormer, and A. C. Gossard, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **48**, 1559 (1982).
- ²R. B. Laughlin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **50**, 1395 (1983).
- ³G. Moore and N. Read, *Nucl. Phys. B* **360**, 362 (1991).
- ⁴N. Read and E. Rezayi, *Phys. Rev. B* **59**, 8084 (1999).
- ⁵P. Bonderson, V. Gurarie, and C. Nayak, *Phys. Rev. B* **83**, 075303 (2011).
- ⁶S. A. Parameswaran, R. Roy, and S. L. Sondhi, *Phys. Rev. B* **85**, 241308 (2012).
- ⁷T. Scaffidi and G. Moller, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 246805 (2012).
- ⁸R. Roy, arXiv:1208.2055.
- ⁹Z. Liu and E. J. Bergholtz, *Phys. Rev. B* **87**, 035306 (2013).
- ¹⁰Y.-H. Wu, J. K. Jain, and K. Sun, *Phys. Rev. B* **86**, 165129 (2012).
- ¹¹Y.-L. Wu, N. Regnault, and B. A. Bernevig, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 106802 (2013).
- ¹²C. H. Lee, R. Thomale, and X.-L. Qi, arXiv:1207.5587.
- ¹³S. M. Girvin, A. H. MacDonald, and P. M. Platzman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **54**, 581 (1985); *Phys. Rev. B* **33**, 2481 (1986).
- ¹⁴B. Yang, Z.-X. Hu, Z. Papić, and F. D. M. Haldane, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 256807 (2012).
- ¹⁵A. Pinczuk, B. S. Dennis, L. N. Pfeiffer, and K. W. West, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 3983 (1993).
- ¹⁶C. J. Mellor, R. H. Eyles, J. E. Digby, A. J. Kent, K. A. Benedict, L. J. Challis, M. Henini, C. T. Foxon, and J. J. Harris, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74**, 2339 (1995).
- ¹⁷U. Zeitler, A. M. Devitt, J. E. Digby, C. J. Mellor, A. J. Kent, K. A. Benedict, and T. Cheng, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 5333 (1999).
- ¹⁸M. Kang, A. Pinczuk, B. S. Dennis, L. N. Pfeiffer, and K. W. West, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 2637 (2001).
- ¹⁹C. F. Hirjibehedin, I. Dujovne, A. Pinczuk, B. S. Dennis, L. N. Pfeiffer, and K. W. West, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 066803 (2005).
- ²⁰G. Moller, A. Wojs, and N. R. Cooper, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 036803 (2011).
- ²¹R. K. Kamilla, X. G. Wu, and J. K. Jain, *Phys. Rev. B* **54**, 4873 (1996).
- ²²G. J. Sreejith, A. Wojs, and J. K. Jain, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 136802 (2011).
- ²³I. D. Rodriguez, A. Sterdyniak, M. Hermanns, J. K. Slingerland, and N. Regnault, *Phys. Rev. B* **85**, 035128 (2012).
- ²⁴B. A. Bernevig and F. D. M. Haldane, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 246802 (2008).
- ²⁵B. A. Bernevig and F. D. M. Haldane, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 066802 (2009).
- ²⁶R. Thomale, A. Sterdyniak, N. Regnault, and B. A. Bernevig, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 180502 (2010).
- ²⁷X. G. Wen and A. Zee, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69**, 953 (1992).
- ²⁸The center of mass angular momentum raising and lowering operators are given by $L^+ = \sum_i z_i$ and $L^- = \sum_i \partial_{z_i}$, which both commutes with the Hamiltonian due to rotational invariance. The highest weight condition of a state ψ is defined as $L^- \psi = 0$, so the state ψ does not have center of mass rotation.
- ²⁹F. D. M. Haldane, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **51**, 605 (1983).
- ³⁰Bo Yang, Z. Papić, E. H. Rezayi, R. N. Bhatt, and F. D. M. Haldane, *Phys. Rev. B* **85**, 165318 (2012).
- ³¹B. Yang, Z. Papić, and F. D. M. Haldane (work in progress).
- ³²I. V. Tokatly and G. Vignale, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 026805 (2007).
- ³³D. Majumder, S. S. Mandal, and J. K. Jain, *Nature Phys.* **5**, 403 (2009).
- ³⁴X. G. Wen, *Mod. Phys. Lett. B* **5**, 39 (1991).
- ³⁵M. Stone, H. W. Wyld, and R. L. Schult, *Phys. Rev. B* **45**, 14156 (1992).
- ³⁶J. Dubail, N. Read, and E. H. Rezayi, *Phys. Rev. B* **86**, 245310 (2012).
- ³⁷B. Yang (unpublished).