

Novel Excitonic States in Quantum Hall Systems: Bound States of Spin Waves and a Valence Band Hole

John J. Quinn

Department of Physics, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee 37996, USA

Arkadiusz Wójs

Department of Physics, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee 37996, USA
Institute of Physics, Wrocław University of Technology, Wrocław 50-370, Poland

Abstract

If the Zeeman energy is small, the lowest energy excitations of a two dimensional electron gas at filling factor $\nu = 1$ are spin waves (spin flip excitations). At ν slightly larger (smaller) than unity, reversed spin electrons (spin holes) can form bound states with K spin waves that are known as skyrmions, S_K^- (antiskyrmions, S_K^+). It is suggested in this work that a valence hole can also bind K spin waves to form an excitonic complex X_K^+ , analogous to the S_K^+ . One spin hole of the S_K^+ is simply replaced by the valence hole. At $\nu \leq 1$, a small number of S_K^+ 's are present before introduction of the valence hole. The $S_K^+ - X_K^+$ repulsion leads to correlations and photoluminescence similar to those of a dilute electron-charged-exciton ($e - X^-$) system at $\nu \leq \frac{1}{3}$. At $\nu \geq 1$, the $S_K^- - X_K^+$ attraction can potentially lead to different behavior.

Keywords: quantum Hall effect, skyrmion, photoluminescence

1 Introduction

It has become clear [1, 2] that neutral (X) and charged (X^-) excitons both play an important role in the photoluminescence (PL) spectrum of realistic quantum Hall systems at high magnetic field and low electron density (i.e. for filling factor $\nu \leq \frac{1}{3}$). This is true despite the “hidden symmetry” of the ideal theoretical model (“ITM” implies zero well width, w , and very high magnetic field, B ; impurity scattering will be ignored in all our calculations) which suggests that PL occurs only from neutral exciton recombination [3]. At values of ν close to unity a considerable body of experimental data exists [4, 5], but no simple picture of the PL process has emerged. In this note we suggest that positively charged excitonic complexes (X_K^+) consisting of K spin waves (SW), each with angular momentum $l_{\text{SW}} = 1$, bound to a valence hole (ν) must occur for $\nu \approx 1$, and that in real experimental systems at low temperature these X_K^+ complexes could

dominate the PL spectrum. A SW consists of a reversed-spin-electron–spin-hole pair (e_R, h) in the lowest Landau level (LL) of the conduction band.

Throughout this paper we contrast the predictions of the ITM with those of realistic systems. The latter requires the admixture of a number of LL’s by the Coulomb interaction and taking into account the finite well width w . Finite separation d between the electron layer and the valence hole layer can also be included. These effects destroy the “hidden symmetry” which occurs when the magnitude $|V_{ij}|$ of the Coulomb interaction is the same for any pair selected from (e_R, h, ν) . The paper is organized in three main sections. Section 2 contains a summary of the results predicted [1] for PL in dilute systems ($\nu \leq \frac{1}{3}$). Section 3 section contains a discussion of the elementary spin excitations [6] of a system of N electrons with ν close to unity in the absence of any valence band holes. In Section 4 a valence hole is introduced into the $\nu \approx 1$ system. The formation of X_K^+ ($\nu + K \times \text{SW}$) complexes is discussed using their analogy to skyrmions or antiskyrmions. The implications for PL of the existence of a quantum liquid consisting of electrons, skyrmions (antiskyrmions) and an X_K^+ for $\nu \geq 1$ ($\nu \leq 1$) are discussed. Some preliminary numerical results for simple realistic systems are presented.

2 Energy Spectrum and PL for $\nu \leq \frac{1}{3}$

It has become rather standard to diagonalize numerically the Coulomb interaction for a finite system of N electrons confined to a spherical surface which contains at its center a magnetic monopole of strength $2Q$ flux quanta [7]. In the ITM only states of the lowest LL are included. For realistic experimental systems (having a finite quantum well width w in a finite magnetic field B) both higher LL’s and the modification for the Coulomb matrix elements associated with the envelope functions of the quantum well must be included.

In Fig. 1 we present the energy spectrum for simple system consisting of two electrons and one valence band hole at $2Q = 20$ evaluated in the ITM and excluding the Zeeman energy [1]. The solid dots are triplet electron states (the total spin of the pair of electrons $S = 1$); the open circles are singlets ($S = 0$). The state labeled $e + X$ at angular momentum $L = 10$ is a “multiplicative state” consisting of an unbound electron and a neutral exciton (X). Notice that only one bound state (labeled X_{td}^-) occurs. It is at $L = 9$ and is called the “dark triplet” because it is forbidden to decay radiatively.

In Fig. 2 similar results are presented for a realistic system consisting of a symmetric GaAs quantum well of width $w = 11.5$ nm at the finite values of the magnetic field $B = 68$ and 13 T. The appropriate electron Zeeman splitting has been included, and only the lowest state of each triplet is shown. To achieve even qualitative agreement with experimental data, it has also been necessary to include a number of higher LL’s, particularly at the lower magnetic fields. Five LL’s were needed to obtain convergence in our calculations. In Fig. 2a, at the high magnetic field of 68 T, the X_{td}^- at $L = 9$ is still the ground state, but singlet and another triplet bound states occur at other values of L (the singlet X_s^- and the triplet X_{tb}^- both at $L = 10$ have roughly half the binding energy of the X_{td}^-). At $B = 13$ T, as shown in Fig. 2b, X_s^- at $L = 10$ is the ground state, and the X_{td}^- at $L = 9$ and X_{tb}^- at $L = 10$ are excited states. The spectrum is quite sensitive to the experimental parameters. The well width w enters the Coulomb interaction [1]




Figure 1: The energy spectrum (energy E vs. angular momentum L) of the $2e-1v$ system on a Haldane sphere with the Landau level degeneracy of $2Q + 1 = 21$. E_X is the exciton energy, and λ is the magnetic length. Different symbols distinguish between singlet ($S = 0$) and triplet ($S = 1$) states.

through $V(r) = e^2 / \sqrt{r^2 + d^2}$, where d is proportional to w . The cyclotron frequencies $\omega_{ce}(B)$ and $\omega_{cv}(B)$ for the electrons and valence band hole, and the Zeeman energy $E_Z(B)$, are taken from experiment, after Refs. [8] and [9], respectively. For the values of the parameters used in our calculations, the singlet and triplet ground states cross at a value of B of the order of 30 T. This is in agreement with the calculations of Whittaker and Shields [10] who used a different numerical approach. Because exact diagonalization gives the eigenfunctions as well as the eigenvalues, it is straightforward to evaluate matrix elements of the luminescence operator $\hat{L} = \int d^2r \hat{\Psi}_e(r) \hat{\Psi}_v(r)$ between an initial state Φ_i of N electrons and one valence hole, and final states Φ_f containing $N - 1$ electrons. $\hat{\Psi}_e$ and $\hat{\Psi}_v$ are the annihilation operators for an electron and valence hole respectively. The oscillator strength for the transition [11] from $|\Phi_i\rangle$ to $|\Phi_f\rangle$ is proportional to $|\langle \Phi_f | \hat{L} | \Phi_i \rangle|^2$. For an isolated charged exciton X^- (where $N = 2$) angular momentum conservation forbids the lowest triplet (X_{td}^-) from decaying radiatively; the subscript “d” stands for “dark”. The singlet X_s^- and the excited triplet X_{tb}^- (“b” stands for “bright”) both have finite oscillator strengths which are of the same order of magnitude.

When additional electrons are present ($N > 2$) radiative decay of the X_{td}^- is not strictly forbidden, since in the recombination process an unbound electron can scatter, changing the momentum of the final state. However, it was found that for $\nu \leq \frac{1}{3}$ such decays are weak because Laughlin correlations of the X^- with unbound electrons inhibit close collisions. The amplitude for radiative decay of the X_{td}^- is estimated [1] to be smaller by one or more orders of magnitude than those of the X_s^- and X_{tb}^- . It was suggested in [1] that the X_{td}^- would be difficult to see in PL, and that the non-crossing




Figure 2: Same as Fig. 1, but for a realistic GaAs quantum well of width $w = 11.5$ nm at the finite values of magnetic field B as shown. The Zeeman energy has been included, and five LL's for both electrons and hole have been used in the diagonalization.

peaks observed by Hayne *et al.* [12] were the X_s^- and X_{tb}^- . The presence of impurities relaxes the $\Delta L = 0$ selection rule, and the X_{td}^- peak is clearly observed at very low temperature where the excited X_{tb}^- and X_s^- states are sparsely populated [2]. The agreement of experiment [2] and the numerical predictions [1] reinforce the hope of using PL to understand correlations in fractional quantum Hall systems.

3 Spin Excitations Near $\nu = 1$

For filling factor ν equal to unity, the lowest energy excitations are spin flip excitations which create a reversed spin electron, e_R , in the same $n = 0$ LL leaving behind a spin hole, h , in the otherwise filled $\nu = 1$ state. Even when the Zeeman energy E_Z is zero, the Coulomb exchange energy will spontaneously break the spin (\uparrow, \downarrow) symmetry giving a spin polarized ground state. In Fig. 3a we show the low lying spin excitations of the $\nu = 1$ state (with E_Z taken to be zero) for a system of $N = 12$ electrons [6]. The solid square at $L = 0$ is the spin polarized $\nu = 1$ ground state with spin $S = 6$. The symbol $K = \frac{1}{2}N - S$ is the number of spin flips away from the fully spin polarized state. The band of open squares connected by a dashed line gives the spin wave dispersion $\epsilon_{SW}(L)$. The angular momentum L is related to wave number k by $L = kR$, where R is the radius of the spherical surface to which the N electrons are confined. The SW consists of a single $e_R h$ pair; its dispersion can be evaluated analytically [13]. The solid circles, open circles, etc. represent states containing 2, 3, ... spin flips (i.e. 2, 3, ... $e_R h$ pairs). Dot-dashed lines connect low lying states with equal numbers of spin flips. It is interesting to note the almost straight line connecting the lowest energy states at $0 \leq L \leq 6$. This can be interpreted as band of K SW's each with $l_{SW} = 1$ with $L = K$. The near linearity




Figure 3: The energy spectra of 12 electrons in the lowest LL calculated on Haldane sphere with $2Q = 11$ (a) and 12 (b).

suggests that these K SW's are very nearly non-interacting. In Fig. 3b we show the numerical results for the situation in which $2Q = 12$ (Q is the angular momentum of the lowest LL or angular momentum shell), so that one vacancy must be present in the $\nu = 1$ state. The notation is the same as in Fig. 3a. Here the $S = 0$ state appears at $L = 6$. This is simply the single spin hole of $l = Q = 6$. What is most interesting in the figure is the band of low lying states containing $K = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ SW's bound to the spin hole. The energy decreases with increasing K , but the decrease is slower than linear. In Fig. 3 we have neglected the Zeeman energy (taken the g -value equal to zero). For a finite g -value the Zeeman energy is simply KE_Z , where E_Z is the Zeeman energy of a single spin flip. The Coulomb energy of the lowest state containing K SW's is $E_C(K) \approx E_C(\frac{1}{2}N) + \beta S^2$, where β is a parameter, $E_C(\frac{1}{2}N)$ is the energy of the lowest $L = S = 0$ state in Fig. 3b, and S , the total spin, is equal to $\frac{1}{2}N - K$. Adding the Zeeman energy KE_Z leads to a total energy $E(K) = E_C(\frac{1}{2}N) + \beta(\frac{1}{2}N - K)^2 + E_Z K$. This energy has a minimum at $K = K_0 = \frac{1}{2}(N - E_Z/\beta)$ implying that the lowest state contains approximately K_0 spin flips. For $E_Z = 0$, $K_0 = \frac{1}{2}N$, and the ground state is completely depolarized (i.e. $S = 0$). As E_Z is increased, the number of spin flips, K , in the lowest energy state decreases until at $E_Z > \beta N$ only the spin hole in the $\nu = 1$ state remains. The state with the integral value of K (closest to K_0) which gives the lowest energy is a measure of the size of the antiskyrmion, the state consisting of K SW's bound to a spin hole in the $\nu = 1$ state [14]. By electron-hole symmetry the state containing one reversed spin electron, e_R , in addition to the filled $\nu = 1$ level will form an analogous skyrmion state consisting of K SW's bound to the original e_R .

The most stable skyrmion or antiskyrmion size depends weakly on the quantum well width for the $\nu \approx 1$ state, but for $\nu \approx 3, 5, \dots$ the well width w must be of the order of a few times the magnetic length in order to obtain stable bound states of SW's and spin holes or reversed spin electrons [6, 15]. As reported by Melik-Alaverdian *et al.*

[16], the inclusion of the admixture of higher LL's caused by the Coulomb interaction weakly affects the skyrmion energy spectrum, particularly when the finite well width w is also taken into account.

The skyrmion and antiskyrmion states S_K^\pm are quite analogous to the excitonic X_K^\pm states of valence band holes interacting with conduction band electrons. In the ITM, a valence hole has exactly the same interactions as a spin hole in the $\nu = 1$ state of the conduction band. In fact these two types of holes can probably be distinguished by an isospin as is done for electrons on different layers of a bilayer system [17]. The spectrum and possible condensed states of a multicomponent Fermion liquid containing electrons, X_1^-, X_2^-, \dots , etc., has been considered by Wójs *et al.* [18]. Exactly the same ideas are applicable to a liquid of electrons and skyrmions or antiskyrmions of different sizes. The only difference is that the skyrmion $S^- = he_R^2$ is stable while the $X^- = ve^2$ has a finite lifetime for radiative recombination of an electron–valence-hole pair.

When there are N_h spin holes in the $\nu = 1$ level (or N_e reversed spin electrons in addition to the filled $\nu = 1$ level) and when N_h (or N_e) is much smaller than $N \approx 2Q + 1$, the degeneracy of the filled lowest LL, then the most stable configuration will consist of N_h antiskyrmions (or N_e skyrmions) of the most stable size. These antiskyrmions (or skyrmions) repel one another. They are positively (or negatively) charged Fermions with standard LL structure, so it is not surprising that they would form either a Wigner lattice or a Laughlin condensed state with ν for the antiskyrmion (or skyrmion) equal to an odd denominator fraction as discussed in Refs. [6, 19, 20].

4 Photoluminescence Near $\nu = 1$

In the ITM, a valence hole acts exactly like a spin hole in the $\nu = 1$ level of the conduction band. Therefore we would expect an excitonic complex consisting of K SW's bound to the valence hole to be the lowest energy state, in the same way that the antiskyrmion consisting of K SW's bound to a spin hole in the $\nu = 1$ level gives the lowest energy state when E_Z is less than βN . For a small number of valence holes, the $X_K^+ = \nu(e_R h)^K$ excitonic complexes formed by each valence hole will repel one another. If a small number of antiskyrmions are already present (for $\nu < 1$), the positively charged antiskyrmion–charged-exciton repulsion will lead to Laughlin correlations or Wigner crystallization of the multicomponent Fermion liquid. Just as for the X^- excitons in the dilute regime, the PL at low temperature will be dominated by the $X_K^+ \rightarrow S_{K'}^+ + \gamma$ process, with $K' = K$ or $K - 1$ depending on spin of the annihilated valence hole (i.e. on the circular polarization of the emitted photon γ). This corresponds to the most stable X_K^+ undergoing radiative ev or $e_R \nu$ recombination and leaving behind an antiskyrmion consisting of K or $K - 1$ SW's bound to a spin hole of the $\nu = 1$ state. Because the valence hole and the spin hole in the $\nu = 1$ conduction level are distinguishable (or have different isospin) even in the ITM this PL is not forbidden.

It will be very interesting to see how realistic sample effects (finite well width, LL admixture, finite separation between the electron and valence hole layers) alter the conclusions of the ITM. As one preliminary example we show in Fig. 4 the binding energy of the $X_1^+ = \nu(e_R h)$ and $X_2^+ = \nu(e_R h)^2$ complexes for different values of the




Figure 4: Binding energies of $X_1^+ = v(e_R h)$ at $L = Q - 1$ and Q , and of $X_2^+ = v(e_R h)^2$ at $L = Q - 2$ as a function of d , the e - v layer separation. The calculations are for a GaAs quantum well of width 10 nm at a magnetic field $B = 20$ T. Different curves include one, two, and three LL's for the valence hole.

total angular momentum L as a function of the separation between the electron and valence hole layers. The calculation was done for parameters corresponding to a GaAs quantum well of width $w = 10$ nm, at a magnetic field of 20 T. Different symbols (open circles, open diamonds, and solid circles) are for calculations in which one, two, or three LL's for the valence hole have been included (inter-LL excitations of conduction electrons are less important due to their smaller effective mass). Clearly, binding energies decrease with increasing layer separation as expected.

The situation is quite more complicated at $\nu \geq 1$, when negatively charged skyrmions are present before the introduction of the valence holes. The skyrmions are attracted by either the valence hole ν or the X_K^+ charge exciton to form the neutral multiexciton complexes $X_K = (e_R \nu)(e_R h)_{K-1}$ [21] or the negatively charged skyrmion excitons $X_K^- = e_R(e_R \nu)(e_R h)_{K-1}$. On the other hand, each charged complex may induce and bind a number of SW's. How these interactions affect the PL of realistic systems can only be guessed, and we are currently investigating real sample effects in systems containing a small number of skyrmions (or antiskyrmions) and valence band excitonic complexes. However, let us present in Fig. 5 the results obtained in the ITM.

The fact that the binding energy for the $e_R \nu + e_R h \rightarrow X_2$ process remains negative for $d \leq 1.35\lambda$ suggests that in symmetric structures the attraction between ν and S_1^- (or a larger skyrmion) causes breakup of the latter and emission of free SW's: $\nu + e_R(e_R h)_K \rightarrow e_R \nu + K \times e_R h$. This would make the equilibrium PL signal come from the same (neutral) excitonic complex, $e_R \nu$, regardless of the size of the skyrmions present in the system. On the other hand, the $e_R \nu$ exciton might attract a second e_R or S^- to acquire charge, and then become able to induce and bind one or more SW's to form a large X_K^- .




Figure 5: Binding energies of $X_2 = (e_R v)(e_R h)$, $X_1^- = e_R(e_R v)$, and $X_2^- = e_R(e_R v)(e_R h)$ as a function of d , the e - v layer separation. The calculations are for the ideal theoretical model (ITM), the monopole strength is $2Q = 30$, and λ is the magnetic length.

We believe that numerical diagonalization for realistic models including LL admixture and finite well width should explain the behavior of PL for electron filling factors close to unity. The qualitative behavior expected has been discussed in this note. Realistic “numerical experiments” are being carried out to check whether the expected behavior is correct. These results will be reported elsewhere.

Acknowledgment

The authors wish to acknowledge partial support from the Materials Research Program of Basic Energy Sciences, US Department of Energy and thank I. Szlufarska for helpful discussions. AW acknowledges partial support from the Polish State Committee for Scientific Research (KBN) grant 2P03B05518.

References

- [1] A. Wójs, J. J. Quinn, and P. Hawrylak, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 4630 (2000); I. Szlufarska, A. Wójs, and J. J. Quinn, Phys. Rev. B **63**, 085305 (2001).
- [2] G. Yusa, H. Shtrikman, and I. Bar-Joseph, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 216402 (2001); T. Vanhoucke, M. Hayne, M. Henini, and V. V. Moshchalkov, Phys. Rev. B **63**, 125331 (2001); C. Schuller, K. B. Broocks, C. Heyn, and D. Heitmann, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 081301 (2002).

- [3] A. H. MacDonald and E. H. Rezayi, Phys. Rev. B **42**, 3224 (1990); A. B. Dzyubenko and Yu. E. Lozovik, J. Phys. A **24**, 414 (1991); V. M. Apalkov and E. I. Rashba, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 1628 (1992).
- [4] D. Heiman, B. B. Goldberg, A. Pinczuk, C. W. Tu, A. C. Gossard, and J. H. English, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 605 (1988); A. J. Turberfield, S. R. Haynes, P. A. Wright, R. A. Ford, R. G. Clark, J. F. Ryan, J. J. Harris, and C. T. Foxon, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 637 (1990); B. B. Goldberg, D. Heiman, A. Pinczuk, L. N. Pfeiffer, and K. West, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 641 (1990).
- [5] Z. X. Jiang, B. D. McCombe, and P. Hawrylak, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 3499 (1998); H. A. Nickel, G. S. Herold, T. Yeo, G. Kioseoglou, Z. X. Jiang, B. D. McCombe, A. Petrou, D. Broido, and W. Schaff, Phys. Status Solidi B **210**, 341 (1998); L. Gravier, M. Potemski, P. Hawrylak, and B. Etienne, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 3344 (1998); H. Buhmann, L. Mansouri, J. Wang, P. H. Beton, N. Mori, M. Heini, and M. Potemski, Phys. Rev. B **51**, 7969 (1995); T. Wojtowicz, M. Kutrowski, G. Karczewski, J. Kossut, F. J. Teran, and M. Potemski, Phys. Rev. B **59**, R10 437 (1999).
- [6] A. Wójs and J. J. Quinn, Solid. State. Commun **122**, 407 (2002); A. Wójs and J. J. Quinn, Phys. Rev. B **66**, 045323 (2002).
- [7] F. D. M. Haldane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **51**, 605 (1983); F. D. M. Haldane and E. H. Rezayi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 956 (1988).
- [8] B. E. Cole, J. M. Chamberlain, M. Henini, T. Cheng, W. Batty, A. Wittlin J. A. A. J. Perenboom, A. Ardavan, A. Polisski, and J. Singleton, Phys. Rev. B **55**, 2503 (1997).
- [9] 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**, 11 345 (1991); M. Seck, M. Potemski, and P. Wyder, Phys. Rev. B **56**, 7422 (1997).
- [10] D. M. Whittaker and A. J. Shields, Phys. Rev. B **56**, 15185 (1997).
- [11] X. M. Chen and J. J. Quinn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 2130 (1993); Phys. Rev. B **50**, 2354 (1994); A. Wójs and J. J. Quinn, Phys. Rev. B **63**, 045304 (2001); A. Wójs and J. J. Quinn, Solid State Commun. **118**, 225 (2001).
- [12] M. Hayne, C. L. Jones, R. Bogaerts, C. Riva, A. Usher, F. M. Peeters, F. Herlach, V. V. Moshchalkov, and M. Henini, Phys. Rev. B **59**, 2927 (1999).
- [13] C. Kallin and B. I. Halperin, Phys. Rev. B **30**, 5655 (1984).
- [14] S. L. Sondhi, A. Karlhede, S. A. Kivelson, and E. H. Rezayi, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 16419 (1993); H. A. Fertig, L. Brey, R. Côté, and A. H. MacDonald, Phys. Rev. B **50**, 11018 (1994); A. H. MacDonald, H. A. Fertig, and L. Brey, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 2153 (1996); H. A. Fertig, L. Brey, R. Côté, and A. H. MacDonald, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 1572 (1996); X. C. Xie and S. He, Phys. Rev. B **53**, 1046 (1996); H. A. Fertig, L. Brey, R. Côté, A. H. MacDonald, A. Karlhede, and S. L. Sondhi, Phys. Rev. B **55**, 10671 (1997).

- [15] N. R. Cooper, Phys. Rev. B **55**, R1934 (1997).
- [16] V. Melik-Alaverdian, N. E. Bonesteel, and G. Ortiz, Phys. Rev. B **60**, R8501 (1999).
- [17] S. Das Sarma and P. I. Tamborenea, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 1971 (1994); L. Brey, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 4692 (1998); D. C. Marinescu, J. J. Quinn, and G. F. Giuliani, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 7245 (2000).
- [18] A. Wójs, I. Szlufarska, K. S. Yi, and J. J. Quinn, Phys. Rev. B **60**, R11273 (1999).
- [19] A. Wójs, P. Hawrylak, and J. J. Quinn, Phys. Rev. B **60**, 11661 (1999).
- [20] L. Brey, H. A. Fertig, R. Côté, and A. H. MacDonald, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 2562 (1995); R. Côté, A. H. MacDonald, L. Brey, H. A. Fertig, S. M. Girvin, and H. T. C. Stoof; Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 4825 (1997). B. Paredes and J. J. Palacios, Phys. Rev. B **60**, 15570 (1999).
- [21] N. R. Cooper and D. B. Chklovskii, Phys. Rev. B **55**, 2436 (1997); T. Portengen, J. R. Chapman, V. N. Nicopoulos, and N. F. Johnson, Phys. Rev. B **56**, R10052 (1997).