Emerging SYK physics in polaron system
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The polaron is treated as a long-lived quasiparticle with slow momenta and current relaxation in Fermi liquid phase. While in this paper, we discuss the possible realization of SYK physics in a polaron system in non-Fermi liquid phase. We reveal the relation between UV cutoff of polaronic momentum $\Lambda_q$ and its SYK behavior. The SYK behavior of a polaron system has rarely been investigated before, and the relation between the scattering momentum and the SYK physics has not yet been explored before (to best of our knowledge). We found that the cutoff $\Lambda_q$ directly related to the distribution and statistical variance of polaronic coupling term, which becomes Gaussian variable (or Chi-square variable) in SYK limit (i.e., with a large step number of a fractional distance $\Lambda_q^{-1} \rightarrow \infty$). Also, we show that the different $\Lambda_q^{-1}$ lending support to different phases, including non-Fermi liquid phase and (disordered) Fermi liquid phase, which correspond to ill-defined and well-defined polarons, respectively.

1 Introduction

The SYK physics emergents usually in the non-Fermi liquid phase with SYK coupling much larger than the fermionic frequency and while the fermionic frequency much larger than the coherence scala (incoherent critical metal phase). In such a regime, the quantum critical behaviors can be found in itinerant electron system due to the quantum fluctuation induced quantum phase transition between disordered state (like the gapped symmetry-broken state or gapless thermal insulator) and the Fermi liquid state.

In conformal limit (without the time derivative term), there is a U(1) global symmetry in nonperturbed SYK mode. When there is a spontaneous symmetry breaking due to the finite $\langle b \rangle$, where $b$ is the boson operator induced by the charge or spin fluctuation, the many-body spectrum is gapped out but may accompanied by a gapless Goldstone mode due to the preserved (subsystem) symmetries (if any), which is stable against to the phase fluctuation of corresponding order parameter. The U(1) gauge symmetry of SYK$q=4$ term with four-fermion interaction will broken by the hopping term which lacks its hermitian conjugate. While for the two-SYK mode interacting system, the $U(1) \times U(1)$ can be preserved as long as the hopping term $\langle b \rangle$ do not contributes to the inter-SYK mode propagation (e.g., in the SU(2) symmetries case). Thus the SYK$q=4$ term is unstable to perturbation of bilinear term (like the hopping insteads of single particle chemical potential term).

Different to the SYK mode, the polaron coupling is constant and short-ranged, thus the many-bpdy effect is perturbative. While the SYK mode has an nonperturbative many-body effect in Wigner-Dyson random matrix ensemble, which can not be fully captured by two-point
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correlation (single-particle function), and thus the functional-derivative approach would not be useful here, due to the randomness of SYK coupling and disorders. However, the polaronic coupling is considered to be short-ranged (and even approximately the contact type) which is similar to the short-range spectral correlation of SYK model, and also, the polaronic coupling decays exponentially with real space distance (or approximately decays exponentially with bandwidth or coherence scale in momentum space), which is similar to the exponentially decay of SYK mode self-energy in long-time limit (low-energy boson excitation) with charging process, the SYK physics may emerges in polaron system in the range $U/N \ll \omega_c \ll \omega \ll q_g \ll N$ of frequency space, where $\omega_c = W^2/g_b$ is coherence scala with spectrum bandwidth $W$. Such a limit can be obtained in real space by replacing the frequency with lattice spacing as given in Ref.\[11, 12\].

We know that the formation of polaron replies on the mobility of impurity, i.e., the impurities and the majority particles are coherent and contribute to finite bandwidth of the polaron spectrum. While the SYK term exhibits incoherent non-Fermi liquid features expecially in the gapless critical metal phase where the stable mode (boson excitation insteads of quasiparticle) remains gapless even without turning to the quantum critical point (and thus without the condensation) due to the preserved symmetries, and contributes to the many-body chaotic spectrum.

2 Electonic properties of polaron and related momentum-dependent dynamics

Firstly we discuss the eletronic properties of polaron and the role played by polaronic momentum $q$ during the scattering.

2.1 Self-energy and polariztion function

When the formation of polaron does not contains the component which has a macroscopic amount, like the phonons or photons (in a cavity), the total momentum of the weakly-coupled propagating pair is conservative, and thus the transport relaxation time of polaron reads $1/\tau \sim \Sigma(1) = n g_b$ where $\Sigma(1)$ is the first order contribution to self-energy. $g_b$ is the bare coupling strength which equals to the vacuum scattering matrix $T_v$. For temperature higher than the critical one ($T_c = W^2/g_b$ with $W$ the bandwidth) the non-Fermi-liquid feature, which is hidden by the instability at low temperature, will leads to incoherence between the electronic excitations. Note that the finite-temperature also affects the resonance structure of the polaron spectrum. Also, the strong coupling, like in a strongly correlated metals, will largely reduce the critical temperature, and thus leads to the coherence to incoherence crossover, which also happen in the Dirac/Weyl semimetallic states. We focus on the low-temperature non-Fermi-liquid region in this paper.

We write the isotropic dispersion of the impurity (with spin $\sigma$) and majority (with spin $\sigma'$) particles as (before collision) $\varepsilon_{p\sigma} = p^2$ and $\varepsilon_{k\sigma'} = k^2$, respectively, which is an importanat ansatz in the following calculations. The bare Green’s function in Fermi-liquid phase are $G_{p\sigma}^{-1} = iZ^{-1}\omega - \varepsilon_{p\sigma}$ and $G_{q\sigma'}^{-1} = iZ^{-1}\Omega - \varepsilon_{q\sigma'}$, respectively, where $Z$ is the quasiparticle residue which reads $Z = 1 - (g_q D_0)^2$ in weak-coupling limit, and we define $g_q$ as the polaronic coupling and $D_0$ as the bare density-of-states (DOS).

The Chevy-type variational ansatz for a mobile Bosonic impurity with momentum $p$ dressed by one electron-hole pairs (excitations) is

$$|\psi\rangle = \psi_0 \delta_{p\sigma}^\dagger |0\rangle_{\sigma'} + \sum_q \psi_{kq} c_{p+q-k,\sigma}^\dagger c_{k,\sigma'}^\dagger |0\rangle_{\sigma'},$$

(1)
where $|0\rangle_{\sigma'} = \prod_{k < k_F} c_{k\sigma'}^\dagger |\text{vac}\rangle$ is the group state of majority particles. $c_{k\sigma'}^\dagger$ is the creation operator of the excited particle with momentum $k$, and $c_{q\sigma}$ is the the annihilate operator of the hole at momentum $q$. Here $k > k_F$ is for ensures the particles are excited out of the Fermi surface.

We write the polaron Hamiltonian in a continuum model as (omits the arrows in the subscript)

$$H = \sum_p \varepsilon_p c_p^\dagger c_p + \sum_k \varepsilon_{k\sigma'} c_k^\dagger c_k + \sum_{k,p,q} g_{q}(p - q) c_p^\dagger c_k^\dagger c_{k+q} c_p.$$  

\hspace{1cm} (2)

where $g_q$ is the $q$-dependent polaronic coupling.

When the pair propagator is not considered, the tadpole-type self-energy at zero-temperature limit reads ($\Omega = (2n + 1)\pi T$)

$$\Sigma_t = \int_q \int_{2\pi} \frac{d\Omega}{2\pi} G_{0\sigma}(p - q, \omega - \Omega) g_q$$

\hspace{1cm} (3)

\begin{align*}
= & T \int_q \sum_{n = -N}^{N} \frac{g_q}{iZ^{-1}(\omega - \Omega) - (p - q)} \\
= & T \int_q \sum_{\alpha = 1}^{2N-1} \frac{2g_q(-p + q + i\omega Z^{-1})}{(-p + q + i\omega Z^{-1})^2 - (\alpha i\pi T Z^{-1})^2} + \frac{g_q}{-p + q - (2N + 1)i\pi T Z^{-1} + i\omega Z^{-1}}.
\end{align*}

For $N = \infty$, we arrives at

$$\Sigma_t = T \int_q g_q Z \frac{1}{-i\omega + (p - q) Z} + \coth \left( \frac{i\omega - pZ + qZ}{T} \right) [T^{-1}]$$

\hspace{1cm} (4)

\begin{align*}
= & T g_q (\text{ln}[-i\omega + pZ + Z\Lambda_q - \text{csch}[i\omega - pZ + Z\Lambda_q])T^{-1}(i\omega - pZ + Z\Lambda_q)\text{sinh}[i\omega - pZ - Z\Lambda_q)T^{-1}]],
\end{align*}

where we set the momentum cutoff as $q \in [-\Lambda_q, \Lambda_q]$.

Here the bare coupling term equivalent to the $T$-matrix in first-order of ladder expansion, i.e., $n g_b = T$ where $n$ is the density of majority particle that excited out of the Fermi surface (but not excited out of the medium), since we consider only the vertices with the excitations created from or ahinilate to the majority component, and donot consider the propagators of ingong and outgoing particles which are absorbed into and emitted from the Fermi bath through the scattering, respectively, although they may important in a dilute BEC at both zero- and low-temperature which is the so-called Belyaev-type diagram), and here the $T$-matrix is close to the vacuum one. The mean field energy shift $n g_b$ (first order contribution to the self-energy) here, as a impurity potential model, is also applicable for a randomly distributed uncorrelated impurities system, as apply in Ref.[3]. Note that the density $n$ (as well as the Fermi momentum $p_F$) here will affected by the temperature and interaction strength just like in the ultracold liquid or gas: $n \propto T_c/T (T \ll T_c), n \propto 1/(\ln g_b)[4, 5, 6]$. Base the above expression, for order of majority dispersion $\beta = 1, 2$, the self-energy can be exactly solved, but for $\beta \geq 3$, we can only obtain the series expansion of the self-energy in terms of the momentum of majority particles. Since we focus on the impurity momentum-dependence (locally critical theory), the integral over frequency $\Omega$ is not done.

Base on the diagrammatic approach, the contribution to the polaron self-energy from the
sunset diagram can be written as

\[ \Sigma_s(p, \omega) = \int_q \left( \frac{d\Omega}{2\pi} \right) G(p-q, \omega - \Omega) T(q, \Omega) \approx T(p, \omega) \]

\[ \approx \frac{1}{g_b^{-1} - \Pi(p, \omega)} \]

\[ = g_b + g_b^2 \Pi(p, \omega) + g_b^3 \Pi^2(p, \omega) + \cdots \]  

(5)

where \( \Pi(p - q, \omega - \Omega) \) is the impurity-majority pair propagator. The approximation in second line is valid (see, e.g., [7, 1]) since the vertices (with vertex correction) contained in first line of above expression are suppressed, in contact interaction approximation, and also by a low density of the majority particles in the region where \( g_b \neq 0 \). Such a short-range interaction (thus with small size of bound state) and low-density feature make the scattering potential can be safely replaced by a contact potential. While for a large density of majority component, the single-particle bubble should be taken into account, i.e., the majority propagator \( G_{0\sigma'}(p-q, \omega-\Omega) \) should be kept. We note that the vertex correction will break the gauge symmetry and gap out the boson excitations. While for the stable gapless boson excitation (like algebraic spin liquid) located in the Gaussian fixed point, the vertex correction becomes irrelevant, like in the high-temperature DMFT insulating phase or the incoherent critical metal phase (SYK) at intermediate-temperature regime [2, 18, 16, 17]. For low-energy electron-hole excitations with \( q \ll p \), we approximate

\[ \varepsilon_p - \varepsilon_{p-q} \approx v_F q \cos \theta, \]

\[ N_F(\varepsilon_p) - N_F(\varepsilon_{p-q}) \approx -\delta(\varepsilon_p)(\varepsilon_p - \varepsilon_{p-q}) \approx -\delta(\varepsilon_p) v_F q \cos \theta, \]  

(6)

where \( \theta \) is the angle between \( p \) and \( q \). The particle-hole polarization function (boson self-energy) reads

\[ \Pi_{eh}(p, \omega) = -\int_q \left( \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \right) G(p, \omega) G(p-q, \omega - \Omega) \]

\[ = -\int_q \frac{N_F(\varepsilon_p) - N_F(\varepsilon_{p-q})}{i\omega Z^{-1} - (\varepsilon_p - \varepsilon_{p-q})} \]

\[ = Z D_0 \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \left( 1 - \frac{i\omega}{i\omega - Z D_0 p \cos \theta} \right) \]

\[ = Z D_0 (1 - \frac{\left| \omega \right|}{\sqrt{\omega^2 + Z^2 D_0^2 p^2}}). \]  

(7)

For particle-particle channel’s contribution, we approximate

\[ \varepsilon_{p-q} + \varepsilon_q \approx v_F p \cos \theta', \]

\[ N_F(\varepsilon_{p-q}) + N_F(\varepsilon_q) \approx -\delta(\varepsilon_q)(\varepsilon_{p-q} + \varepsilon_q) \approx -\delta(\varepsilon_q) v_F p \cos \theta', \]  

(8)
where \( \theta' = \pi - \theta \), and we have

\[
\Pi_{ee}(p, \omega) = -\int_q \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} G(p - q, \omega - \Omega)G(q, \Omega)
\]

\[
= -\int_q \frac{1 - N_F(\varepsilon_{p-q}) - N_F(\varepsilon_q)}{i\omega Z^{-1} - \varepsilon_{p-q} - \varepsilon_q}
\]

\[
= -D_0\int_0^{2\pi} d\theta' \frac{1 + v_F \cos \theta'}{2\pi i\omega Z^{-1} - pcos\theta'}
\]

\[
= -ZD_0\int_0^{2\pi} d\theta' \frac{1 + v_F \cos \theta'}{2\pi i\omega - Zv_F \cos \theta'}
\]

\[
= D_0\int_0^{2\pi} d\theta' \frac{(1 - \omega - iZ)}{\sqrt{\omega^2 + Z^2 v_F^2 p^2}}.
\]

thus the sunset diagram self-energies read

\[
\Sigma^h_{es}(p, \omega) = \frac{1}{g_q^{-1} - ZD_0(1 - \frac{|\omega|}{\sqrt{\omega^2 + Z^2 D_0^2 p^2}})}
\]

\[
\Sigma^{ee}_{es}(p, \omega) = \frac{1}{g_q^{-1} - D_0(1 - \frac{|\omega - iZ|}{\sqrt{\omega^2 + Z^2 v_F^2 p^2}})}
\]

Here we note that the spectral function as a function of momentum \( p \) usually has a peak-width slightly larger than that as a function of energy, which implies the energy is a better quantum number here than the momentum, and also consistent with the above statement that the energy conservation is better retained than the momentum conservation during the impurity-majority scattering. This is also in consistent with the result obtained by Ref.[14]. Besides, although not shown, we note that, our calculation reveals that, with the increase of coupling \( g_b \), the spectral function peaks will slightly broadened although it is not very obvious.

### 2.2 Generated Fermion mass term

Due to the interaction, the impurity (fermion) will dynamically obtain a finite fermion mass, which is possible to leads to the charge-density wave (CDW) state. The excitonic mass generation is a nonperturbative result. and the dynamically generated mass term reads

\[
m(p, \omega) = \int_q \int d\Omega \frac{m_0}{2\pi \Omega^2 + q^2 + m_0^2} T(p - q, \omega - \Omega),
\]

where \( m_0 \) is the bare fermion mass in the absence of polaronic coupling. For large order \( \beta \), the low-energy DOS can be treated as a constant \( m \). Firstly, we discuss the \( \Pi = 0 \) case,

\[
m(p, \omega) = \int_q \int d\Omega \frac{m_0}{2\pi \Omega^2 + q^2 + m_0^2} g_q
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} \int_q \frac{m_0}{\sqrt{q^2 + m_0^2}} g_q
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{4\pi} g_q \ln[1 + \frac{2\Lambda_q(\Lambda_q + \sqrt{m_0^2 + \Lambda_q^2})}{m_0^2}]m_0.
\]
In long wavelength limit, the contribution from electron-hole excitation vanishes, and we have

\[ m(\omega) = \int \frac{d\Omega}{2\pi} \frac{m_0}{\Omega^2 + m_0^2} \mathcal{T}_{ee}(\omega - \Omega) \]

\[ = \int \frac{d\Omega}{2\pi} \frac{m_0}{\Omega^2 + m_0^2} \left[ g_q^{-1} - D_0 \left( 1 - \frac{\omega - \Omega - i\omega}{\omega - \Omega} \right) \right]^{-1} \]

\[ = - \frac{(g_q \pi (m_0 + i\omega)}{g_q Z + m_0 + i\omega}, \quad (13) \]

where \( m_0, g_q < 0 \). In Fermi-liquid phase with \( \omega \rightarrow 0 \) limit, it is possible to enter into the hydrodynamic regime when the polaronic interaction scattering rate is large (strong interacting Fermi liquid) \( \tau \propto g_q^{-1} \). And in this case the coupling \( g_q \) is perturbative. Since here the Lorentz invariance is broken, the dependence of mass term on momentum and frequency (of impurity) can be treated separately. We found from this expression that the mass term is proportional to the impurity self-energy and inversely proportional to the eigenenergy of majority particle. This is similar to mass enhancement due to the electron-phonon coupling as described by the Eliashberg theory[?]. Since we apply the gapless dispersion for both the impurity and majority particles in the beginning, the mass enhancement here (due to the interaction effect) is also the final dispersion gap. In high-frequency (UV) limit, the mass tends to zero, which implies that the irrelevance of interaction effect and the polaron dynamic.

While in the instantaneous approximation, the momentum dependence of mass can be obtained as

\[ m(p) = \int \frac{d^d q}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{m_0}{q^2 + m_0^2} T(p - q) \]

\[ = \int \frac{d^d q}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{m_0}{q^2 + m_0^2} \left[ g_q^{-1} - D_0 \left( 1 - \frac{-i\omega}{Z v_F(p - q)} \right) \right]^{-1} + \int \frac{d^d q}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{m_0}{q^2 + m_0^2} \left[ g_q^{-1} - Z D_0 \right]^{-1}. \quad (14) \]

This can be solved analytically in one-dimension space as

\[ m(p) = \frac{g_q \pi v_F (m_0 + ip)}{-D_0 g_q + (-1 + D_0 g_q) v_F (m_0 + ip)} + \frac{-g_q \pi}{1 - g_q Z D_0}, \quad (15) \]

where \( m_0, g_q < 0 \).

As the dispersion order is treated experimental turnable here, we can then obtain a multiple-band system with different bandwidths which exhibit marginal Fermi liquid feature in a finite temperature range, where the transport relaxation time has \( 1/\tau \sim \text{Im} \Sigma \propto \max[\epsilon, T] \) and the quasiparticle weight has \( Z^{-1} \sim \text{Im} \Lambda \). The incoherent part of spectrum becomes dominate over the coherent part (\( \delta \)-function) in this case. Note that for impurity scattering, when the random quenches of the impurities are taken into account, the momentum is no more conservative during the scattering event (due to the finite momentum relaxation), and thus the system exhibit non-Fermi liquid behavior even at zero temperature \( (T = 0) \)[14]. Although the impurity we discuss in this paper is mobile, the scattering can still be treated as elastic as long as the transferred energy is low enough, e.g., much less than the temperature scale. When the elastic scattering by quenched impurities is weak enough (low-energy event) and can be treated as a perturbation, the system can still behaves like a Fermi-liquid one, e.g., obeys the Wiedemann-Franz law or broadened Drude peak in Fermi-liquid metal[15].
3 The emergent SYK coupling

For Fermion operator with scaling dimension 1/4, the SYK\(_{q=4}\) term reads

\[
H_{\text{SYK}} = \sum_{ijkl} \frac{J_{ijkl}}{(2N)^{3/2}} c_i^\dagger c_j^\dagger c_k c_l, \tag{16}
\]

where \(i,j,k,l = 1 \cdots N\). \(J_{ijkl}\) is an antisymmetry tensor which follows a Gaussian distribution with zero mean. The SYK coupling satisfies the relation \(J_{ijkl} = J_{jikl} = -J_{jikl} = J_{klij} = J_{lkij}\). It satisfies the relation after disorder average in Gaussian unitary ensemble

\[
\frac{J_{ijkl}}{(2N)^{3/2}} O \to -\frac{J^2}{8N^3} 2O^\dagger O = -\frac{J^2}{4N^3} O^\dagger O, \tag{17}
\]

where \(O\) is a physical observable quantity which consists of fermion operators with indices different to each other. Similarly, if we restrict the four indices to the region \(i<j; k<l\) (with the corresponding coupling \(J_{ij;kl}\)), we have

\[
\frac{J_{ij;kl}}{(2N)^{3/2}} O \to -\frac{J^2}{16 \times 8N^3} 2O^\dagger O = -\frac{J^2}{32N^3} O^\dagger O, \tag{18}
\]

since \(J_{ij;kl} = J_{ij;kl}/4\) (note that this is indeed an approximated result which is accurate only in \(N \to \infty\) limit; see Appendix A). The time-reversal symmetry as well as the particle-hole symmetry (even at zero chemical potential) is broken in Gaussian unitary ensemble with finite \(N\), but preserved in Gaussian orthogonal ensemble, in which case Eq.\((17)\) becomes

\[
\frac{J_{ijkl}}{(2N)^{3/2}} O \to -\frac{J^2}{32N^3} O^\dagger O. \tag{19}
\]

In this case the \(J_{ijkl}\) is totally antisymmetry and thus the above Hamiltonian is hermitian.

To mapping to the SYK basis, we introduce the following s-wave operators which can expressed in terms of the eigenfunctions of SYK Hamiltonian

\[
\Delta_{-q\sigma} = \sum_p c_{p-q}^\dagger c_{p\sigma} = \sum_{il} \sum_p \phi_i^*(p-q)\phi_l(p)c_i^\dagger c_{l\sigma}, \tag{20}
\]

where the antisymmetry tensors read

\[
\sum_p \phi_i^*(p-q)\phi_l(p) = \Phi_{il}^{-q}, \tag{21}
\]

\[
\sum_k \phi_j^*(k+q)\phi_k(k) = \Phi_{jk}^q, \tag{22}
\]

and the coupling satisfies

Note that the wave functions \(\phi_i, \phi_j, \phi_k, \phi_l\) are not Gaussian variables, but the operators \(\Phi_{il}, \Phi_{jk}\) are uncorrelated random Gaussian variables with zero mean \((\Phi_{il} = \Phi_{jk} = 0)\) as long as \(\Lambda_q \neq 0\), in which case the index \(i(j)\) is completely independent with \(l(k)\). Otherwise, in the SYK limit \(\Lambda_q^{-1} \to \infty (\Lambda_q \to 0)\), \(\Phi_{il}\) and \(\Phi_{jk}\) are no Gaussian variables, while \((\Phi_{il}\Phi_{jk})\) and \(\Phi_{ik}\)
\((\Phi_{ij})\) becomes Gaussian variables. Here the coupling \(J_{ijkl}\) depends fully on the indices \(i, j, k, l\) unlike the following notion \(J\), which is obtained after the disorder average. Then the polaron Hamiltonian can be rewritten as
\[
H_p = \frac{g_p}{N} \sum_{ijkl} \Phi_{il} \Phi_{jk} c^\dagger_i c^\sigma_i c^\sigma_j c^\dagger_k c^\sigma_k.
\]
(23)

In this case, the polaron coupling is still constant, but the wave functions \(\Phi_{il}\) and \(\Phi_{jk}\) are random independent Gaussian variables. This Hamiltonian is similar to the complex SYK model with a conserved global U(1) charge, but with spins.

As we stated in Sec., the calculations related to the polaron dynamics usually requires momentum cutoff \(\Lambda_q\). The polaron coupling reads (with \(E_b\) the binding energy and \(W\) the bandwidth)
\[
g_q^{-1} = -\sum_{kp} \frac{1}{E_b + \varepsilon_p + \varepsilon_k + W},
\]
(24)
which vanishes in \(\Lambda \to \infty\) limit. Similarly, in two space dimension, the polaron corresponds to the pole \(q = ia^{-1}\) where \(a\) is the scattering length (or scattering amplitude), which proportional to the polaronic coupling strength, and the strongest polaronic coupling realized at \(q \sim a^{-1}\) while the weakest coupling realized at \(qa \ll 1\). This is a special property of polaron formation and is important during the following analyzing. Now we know that \(g_q\) is inversely proportional to the value of exchanging momentum \(q\), then the integral in Eq.(24) is vanishingly small when \(\Lambda_q \to \infty\). In opposite limit, when \(\Lambda_q \to 0\), both the couplings \(J_{ijkl}\) and \(g_q\) become very strong (thus enters the SYK regime). Similar to the disorder effect from temperature (which is lower than the coherence scale but higher that other low energy cutoff) to Fermi liquid, the fermion frequency can be treated as a disorder to non-Fermi liquid SYK physics, (the pure SYK regime can be realized in \(\omega, \omega_c \to 0\) limit and extended to zero temperature) thus we can write the essential range of parameter to realizes SYK physics,
\[
\Lambda_q^{-1} \sim \frac{g_q}{\omega v_F} \gg N;
\]
(25)
this is one of the most important result of this paper which relates the polaron physics to the SYK physics, and in the mean time, it is surely important to keep \(N \gg U \gg \omega \gg \omega_c \gg U/N\). Note that here vanishingly small cutoff in momentum space \(\Lambda_q\) corresponds to vanishing spacial disorder \(\Lambda_r\), which is the lattice spacing in two-dimensional lattice in real space[11]. That is, in the presence of short range interaction, by reducing the distance between two lattice sites (and thus enlarging the size of hole), the size number as well as the coupling is increased. Thus in this case the polaron becomes asymptotically Gaussian distributed due to the virtue of the central limit theorem.

In the \(\Lambda_q = 0\) limit (SYK), the polaron term can be rewritten in the exact form of SYK\(_{q=2}\) mode.
\[
H_p = g_q \sum_{ik} \sum_{\sigma,\sigma'} \Phi_i c^\dagger_{i\sigma} c^\sigma_i \Phi_k c^\dagger_{k\sigma'} c^\sigma_k
\]
\[
\equiv g_q \sum_{ik} \sum_{\sigma,\sigma'} b_{i\sigma} b_{k\sigma'},
\]
(26)
where \(b_i = \Phi_i c^\dagger_{i\sigma} c^\sigma_i\) and \([b_i, H_p] = 0\). Similar to Eq.(17), after disorder average in Gaussian unitary ensemble (GUE), for Gaussian variable \(\Phi_{il}\Phi_{jk}\), we have
\[
\Phi_{il}\Phi_{jk} = 0,
\]
(27)
and the replication process reads

\[ g_q \Phi_{il\sigma} \Phi_{jk\sigma'} O_{il,jk} \rightarrow \frac{J^2 \delta_{ij} \delta_{jk} 2O_{il,jk}^\dagger O_{il,jk}}{16N^2} = \frac{J^2 \delta_{ij} \delta_{jk} O_{ik}^\dagger O_{ik}^\dagger O_{lj}^\dagger O_{lj} O}{8N^2}. \tag{28} \]

Note that before replication, the number of observable \( O \) should equals to the number of Gaussian variables, which is one in the above formula. Here the prefactors follows the scheme of SYK\(_{q=2} \), i.e., the above polaron Hamiltonian can be viewed as a SYK\(_{q=2} \) model, and each fermion operator (with independent indices, like \( i \) and \( j \) or \( l \) and \( k \)) contributes to the prefactor. This is unlike the SYK\(_{q=2} \) case as we will introduce in below.

While in the finite but small \( \Lambda_q \) case

\[ H_p = g_q \sum_{il,jk,\sigma,\sigma'} \sum_{\Phi_{il\sigma}^\dagger, \Phi_{jk\sigma'}^\dagger} \Phi_{il\sigma}^\dagger \Phi_{jk\sigma'}^\dagger \delta_{ij} \delta_{jk} \Lambda_q^2 4O_{ik}^\dagger O_{ik}^\dagger O_{lj}^\dagger O_{lj} (2O_q^\dagger O_q)^2 \]

where we have

\[ g_q \Phi_{il\sigma}^\dagger \Phi_{jk\sigma'}^\dagger O_{ik}^\dagger O_{lj}^\dagger O_{lj} \rightarrow \frac{J^2 \delta_{ij} \delta_{jk} \Lambda_q^2 4O_{ik}^\dagger O_{ik}^\dagger O_{lj}^\dagger O_{lj} (2O_q^\dagger O_q)^2}{16N^2} \]

Note that each operator \( O \) must contains \( q \) completely independent (uncorrelated) indices, and before replication, the indices of each operator \( O \) must not be completely the same. For example, in the finite (although small) \( \Lambda_q \) case, \( i \) (\( l \)) is completely independent of \( k \) (\( j \)), but index \( ik \) is not completely uncorrelated with \( lj \) because mapping to their momentum space they have \( i \neq l = k \neq j \) due to the fixed polaronic momentum \( q \), in other word, the mechanism that transforms \( i \) to \( l \) is the same with that to transform \( k \) to \( j \), thus \( ik \) can continuously mapped to \( lj \). So this is neither the simple SYK\(_{q=2} \) scheme or the SYK\(_{q=4} \) scheme (which allows the existence of \( O_{ijkl} \), but a (SYK\(_{q=2} \) × SYK\(_{q=2} \)) scheme, which can be treated as a Chi-square random variables (the product of two independent SYK\(_{q=2} \) Gaussian variables).

After the summation over \( q \) is done, it becomes (SYK\(_{q=2} \) × SYK\(_{q=2} \) × SYK\(_{q'=1} \)) scheme. We note that in the above expression, after the replication, the created new operators \( O \) are all with different imaginary time indices although we omit them here. This discussion is also applicable to the SYK model with SU(M) spin (see Eq.(9) of Ref.[13], which is also a (SYK\(_{q=2} \) × SYK\(_{q=2} \)) scheme).

And in this scheme (SYK\(_{q=2} \) × SYK\(_{q=2} \)), each fermion operator contributes factor

\[ (2 \frac{q/2+1}{2q} N \frac{q-1}{2q})^{-1} [\Lambda_q^{-1}]_{q'}^{-1} = (2 \frac{q/2+1}{2q} N \frac{q-1}{2q})^{-1} [\Lambda_q^{q'}], \tag{32} \]

where \( q = 2 \) since we approximate \( i = l = j = k \) due to the vanishingly small \( \Lambda_q \), and \( q' = 1 \) due to the restriction of \( q = -(q) \) of the antisymmetry tensor \( \Phi^{\pm q} \), i.e., \( \Phi^{-q} \) and \( \Phi^q \) are correlated Gaussian variables (\( \Phi^{-q} = \Phi^q = 0 \)), thus their product do not have zero mean \( \Phi^{-q} \Phi^q \neq 0 \) (and no more be a Gaussian variable). The summation over \( q \) indeed follows SYK\(_{q'=1} \) physics. This is obtained by defining a fractional distance between \( q \geq 0 \) to \( q = \Lambda_q \) (with totally \( \Lambda_q^{-1} \) steps and each reads \( \delta \Lambda_q = \frac{\Lambda_q}{\Lambda_q^{q'}}, = \Lambda_q^2 \)) to carry out the Wigner-Dyson statistics in GUE, although \( \Lambda_q \) must be rather small to guarantees the SYK behaviors. Also, even we do not approximate
$i = l(j = k)$, the summation of $ijkl$ do not follows the SYK$_{q=4}$ physics since the four random Gaussian variables $\phi_{\alpha}(\alpha = i, j, k, l)$ are not independent of each other (once three of them are identified, the last one will be identified). This is another important result of this paper.

In case of finite (but small) $\Lambda_q$ with approximately uncorrelated random Gaussian variables $\Phi_{il}$ and $\Phi_{jk}$ ($\Phi_{il} = \Phi_{jk} = 0$, $g_q \Phi_{il}^2 = g_q \Phi_{jk}^2 = J / 2N^2 \Lambda_q = J / N \Lambda_q$), we can perform the disorder averages over fermion indices and the $q$ in the same time, which leads to the following mean value and variance of Chi-square random variable $g_q \Phi_{il}^{-q} \Phi_{jk}^q$:

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{g_q \Phi_{il}^{-q} \Phi_{jk}^q}{(g_q \Phi_{il}^{-q} \Phi_{jk}^q)^2} &= \frac{2J^2 \Lambda_q^2}{4N^2} \quad \text{(33)}
\end{align*}
\]

Note that this only valid in the case that the disorder average over $q$ fermion indices are done separately, i.e., the degree of freedom of $q$ will not affect the correlation between $\Phi_{il\sigma}$ and $\Phi_{jk\sigma'}$, and vice versa. Besides, $q$ must be integrated in the same dimension of $N$, i.e., one dimension (which is the case we focus on in this paper), and thus $\Lambda_q$ is in the same scale with $N$. If the $q$-integral is be carried out in $d$-space dimension, then the above result becomes

\[
\frac{g_q^2 \Phi_{il}^{-q} \Phi_{jk}^q}{(g_q^2 \Phi_{il}^{-q} \Phi_{jk}^q)^2} = \frac{J^2 \Lambda_q^{2d}}{N^2}. \quad \text{(34)}
\]

because the sample number of $q$ is related to spacial dimension $d$.

Next we take the spin degree of freedom into account. To understand the effects of perturbation brought by finite small $q$ (where the polaronic coupling is still approximately viewed as a constant), we use the SU(2) basis to deal with the degree of freedom of spin (i.e., of impurity and majority particles), $\Phi_{\sigma = \pm} = 1 / \sqrt{2}(\Phi_1 \pm i \Phi_2)$, Then we have

\[
\begin{align*}
&g_q \sum_{\sigma, \sigma'} \sum_{il, jk} \sum_{q} \Phi_{il\sigma}^{-q} \Phi_{jk\sigma'}^q \\
&= g_q \sum_{q} \sum_{il, jk} (\Phi_{il}^{-q} + i \Phi_{il}^{-q})(\Phi_{jk}^q + i \Phi_{jk}^q) - \frac{1}{2}(\Phi_{il}^{-q} - i \Phi_{il}^{-q})(\Phi_{jk}^q - i \Phi_{jk}^q) \\
&= g_q \sum_{q} \sum_{il, jk} (i \Phi_{il}^{-q} \Phi_{jk}^q - i \Phi_{il}^{-q} \Phi_{jk}^q). \quad \text{(35)}
\end{align*}
\]

And we obtain the variance

\[
\begin{align*}
g_q \Phi_{il\sigma}^{-q} \Phi_{jk\sigma'}^q 2\mathcal{O}_t^1 \mathcal{O}_t = g_q \Phi_{il\sigma}^{-q} \Phi_{jk\sigma'}^q 2\mathcal{O}_t^1 \mathcal{O}_t = \frac{J}{4N} \delta_{il, jk} \delta_t 2\mathcal{O}_t^1 \mathcal{O}_t, \\
\frac{g_q \Phi_{il\sigma}^{-q} \Phi_{jk\sigma'}^q}{\Phi_{il\sigma}^{-q} \Phi_{jk\sigma'}^q} = \frac{J \Lambda_t}{N} \delta_{il, jk}, \\
\Phi_{il\sigma}^{-q} \Phi_{jk\sigma'}^q = 0, \quad \text{(36)}
\end{align*}
\]

where $J > 0$. Thus $\Phi_{il\sigma}^{-q}$ is orthogonal with $\Phi_{jk\sigma'}^q$ (as long as the $\Phi_{il}$ is approximately treated as independent of $\Phi_{jk}$ in the small $\Lambda_q$ limit (e.g., the SYK limit), which is important to construct the solvable matrix as presented below).
In the small (but finite) $\Lambda_q$ limit, according to semicircle law, the spectral function of single fermion reads

$$\rho(\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{\pi J} \sqrt{1 - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4J^2}} = \frac{1}{2\pi J^2} \sqrt{4J^2 - \varepsilon^2},$$

where according to Eq. (37)

$$J^2 = \frac{(g_q \Phi^1_{i_1l} \Phi^q_{2j})^2}{\Lambda_q^2} \frac{N^2}{\Lambda_q^2}. \tag{38}$$

The mean value of eigenvalues is thus

$$\left| \int_{\varepsilon < 0} d\varepsilon \rho(\varepsilon) \right| \approx \frac{4J}{3\pi}. \tag{39}$$

Then we obtain that the matrices $g_q \Phi^{-q}_{i_1l} \Phi^q$ and $\Phi^{-q}_{i_1l}$ and $\Phi^q_{2j}$ are $N^2 \times \frac{N^2}{\Lambda_q} (\approx \infty \times \infty)$ matrix, and now these matrices are automatically diagonalized. In such a configuration constructed by us, $g_q \Phi^{-q}_{i_1l} \Phi^q_{2j}$ can not be simply viewed as a product of matrices $g_q \Phi_{i_{1\alpha}} \Phi_{j\sigma}$ and $g_q \Phi^{-q}_{\alpha} \Phi^q$, since $g_q \Phi_{i\beta} \Phi_{j\sigma}$ is a $N^2 \times N^2$ matrix while $g_q \Phi^{-q} \Phi^q$ is a $\Lambda_q^{-1} \times \Lambda_q^{-1}$ diagonal matrix ($q \neq 0$ here). Instead, it requires mapping $il(jk) \rightarrow \frac{a(ijk)}{\sqrt{\Lambda_q}}$ and $q \rightarrow q \frac{1}{N^2}$ (to realizes $\delta \Lambda_q' = \Lambda_q^2 = \Lambda_q^2 \frac{1}{N^2}$). This is the SYK phase with gapless SYK mode, and it requires $\Lambda_q^{-1} \gg N$.

4 Remove the correlation between $\Phi_{i_1l}$ and $\Phi_{j_2k}$ by summing over $q$

The SYK phase can be gapped out due to the broken symmetry by finite eigenvalue of $(g_q \Phi_{i_1l} \Phi_{2j})^2$ (or $(g_q \Phi_{i_{1\alpha}} \Phi_{j\sigma})^2$). To understand this, it is more convenient to use another configuration, where we carry out the summation over $q$ first in Eq.(34), instead of carrying out the disorder averages over $ijkl$ and $q$ in the same time. Then the disorder average over fermion indices $i, j, k, l$ simply results in

$$\overline{(g_q \Phi_{i_1l} \Phi_{2j})^2} = \frac{J^2_{i_1l,j_2k}}{4N^2}, \tag{40}$$

which can be calculated as

$$\overline{(g_q \Phi_{i_1l} \Phi_{2j})^2} = \left( \sum_q g_q \Phi^{-q}_{i_1l} \Phi^q_{1jk} \right)^2$$

$$= \left( g_q \Phi^{-\delta_{\lambda_1}} \Phi_{i_{1l}}^{\delta_{\lambda_1}} + g_q \Phi^{-2\delta_{\lambda_1}} \Phi_{i_{1l}}^{2\delta_{\lambda_1}} + \cdots \right) \overline{\Phi^{-q} \Phi^q}$$

$$= \left( g_q \Phi^{-\delta_{\lambda_1}} \Phi_{i_{1l}}^{\delta_{\lambda_1}} + g_q \Phi^{-2\delta_{\lambda_1}} \Phi_{i_{1l}}^{2\delta_{\lambda_1}} + \cdots \right)^2$$

$$= \frac{J^2}{4N^2} \sum_q (\Phi^{-q} \Phi^q)^2$$

$$= \frac{J^2 4\Lambda_q}{4N^2}$$

$$= \frac{J^2 \Lambda_q}{N^2}. \tag{41}$$

i.e., $J^2_{i_1l,j_2k} = 4\Lambda_q J^2_{i_1l,j_2k}$. The third line is due to the fact about variance of Gaussian variables: $\text{Var}(A + B) = \text{Var}A + \text{Var}B$ where $A$ and $B$ are independent with each other. The fourth line
is because

\[
\text{Var}(\Phi^q) = (\Phi^q)^2 - (\Phi^q)^2 = 2\Lambda_q - 0 = 2\Lambda_q,
\]

\[
\text{Var}(\Phi^{-q}\Phi^q) = (\Phi^{-q}\Phi^q)^2 - (\Phi^{-q}\Phi^q)^2 = 4\Lambda_q^2 - (2\Lambda_q)^2 = 0,
\]

\[
\sum_q \Phi^{-q}\Phi^q \Phi^q = \sum_q (\Phi^{-q}\Phi^q)^2 \Lambda_q^{-1} = 2,
\]

\[
\sum_q (\Phi^{-q}\Phi^q)^2 = (\Phi^{-q}\Phi^q)^2 \Lambda_q^{-1} = 4\Lambda_q,
\]

(42)

where \(\Phi^{-q}\Phi^q\) is obviously not a Gaussian variable (just like the \(\Phi_{il}\Phi_{jk}\) except in the SYK limit), and \(\Phi^{-q}\Phi^q = (\Phi^q)^2 \neq \Phi^{-q}\Phi^q \neq 0\) because it is impossible to make \(\Phi^{-q}\) and \(\Phi^q\) orthogonal to each other due to the connection between them \(q = -(q)\). That is to say, although \(\Phi^{-q}\) and \(\Phi^q\) are Gaussian variables with zero mean \(\Phi^{-q} = \Phi^q = 0\), their product \(\Phi^{-q}\Phi^q\) is not a Gaussian variable and do not have zero mean. This is different to the variance of Chi-square variable \(\Phi_{il}\Phi_{jk}\) which is finite due to the zero mean \(\Phi_{1i}\Phi_{2jk} = \Phi_{1d}\Phi_{2jk} = 0\), by treating them to be approximately mutually orthogonal (i.e., \(\Phi_{il}\Phi_{jk}\) approximately independent with \(\Phi_{jk}\)). Here we note that following relations in new configuration

\[
\sqrt{|g_q|\Phi_{1il}} = \sqrt{|g_q|\Phi_{2jk}} = 0,
\]

\[
\text{Var}(\sqrt{|g_q|\Phi_{1il}}) = g_q \Phi_{1il}^2 = \frac{J}{2N}^2 = \frac{J}{N},
\]

\[
\text{Var}(\sqrt{|g_q|\Phi_{2jk}}) = g_q \Phi_{2jk}^2 = \frac{J}{2N}^2 = \frac{J}{N},
\]

\[
\text{Var}(g_q\Phi_{1il}\Phi_{1jk}) = (g_q\Phi_{1il}\Phi_{1jk})^2 - g_q\Phi_{1il}\Phi_{1jk}^2 = \frac{J^2}{4N^2} 4\Lambda_q \delta_{il,jk} - (\frac{J}{2N})^2 \delta_{il,jk}
\]

\[
= \frac{J^2}{N^2}(\Lambda_q - 1),
\]

(43)

\[
g_q\Phi_{1il}\Phi_{2jk} = 0.
\]

Under this configuration, by approximately treating \(\Phi_{1il}\) and \(\Phi_{2jk}\) to be mutually orthogonal, they can be viewed as two vectors, and each of them contains \(N^2\) components, then \((g_q\Phi_{1il}\Phi_{2jk})^2\) is a \(N^2 \times N^2\) matrix with complex eigenvalues. But note that, away from the \(\Lambda_q^{-1} \to \infty\) limit, this construction fail because exactly speaking, \((g_q\Phi_{1il}\Phi_{2jk})^2\) (after summation over \(q\)) is a \(N \times N \times N = N^3\) matrix (unlike the \(N \times N\) SYK\(q=2\) or the \(N \times N \times N \times N = N^4\) SYK\(q=4\)) due to the polaron property, i.e., over the fermion indices \(i, j, k, l\), one of them is always identified by the other three, so there are at most three independent indices (degrees of freedom).

A precondition to treat Gaussian variables \(i\Phi_{il}\) and \(\Phi_{jk}\) mutrually orthogonal (independent), is that it must away from the \(\Lambda_q^{-1} \to \infty\) limit, since too small sample number will makes the matrix \(g_q\Phi_{-q}\Phi_{q}\) leaves away from the Gaussian distribution according to central limit theorem, and thus the disorder average over \(q\) can not be successively carried out, that is why we instead make the summation over \(q\). Then, the relation \(\Lambda_q^{-1} < N^2/2\ (\Lambda_q > 2/N^2)\) indicates the large number of \(N\), which preserves the Gaussian distribution of \(\Phi_{il}\) and \(\Phi_{jk}\) and also makes the disorder average over fermion indices to matrix \(g_q\Phi_{il}\Phi_{jk}\) more reliable, despite the indices \(il\) and \(jk\) are not completely independent but correlated by some certain mechanism before the summation over \(q\).

Then we turning to the matrix

\[
g_q\Phi^{\pm q}_{il} = ig_q\Phi^{-q}_{1il}\Phi^q_{2jk} - ig_q\Phi^{-q}_{2il}\Phi^q_{1jk},
\]

(44)
which is also a $N^2 \times N^2$ matrix now and is Hermitian (whose eigenvectors and eigenvalues are much more easy to be solved) with all diagonal elements be zero. In this scheme, to make sure $g_q \Phi_{il\sigma}{\Phi}_{j\kappa\sigma}'$ is a $N^2 \times N^2$ matrix, the disorder average over $i, j, k, l$ must be done after the summation over $q$. Then to diagonalizing the $N^2 \times N^2$ matrix $g_q \Phi_{il\sigma}^q \Phi_{j\kappa\sigma}'$, it requires $\Lambda^{-1}_q < N^2/2$ to make sure all the vectors $\Phi_{1il}$ and $\Phi_{2jk}$ are orthogonal with each other within the matrix $g_q \Phi_{il\sigma}^q \Phi_{j\kappa\sigma}'$. This is because there at most exists $N^2$ vectors can orthogonal with each other in $N^2$-dimensional space (formed by $N^2$-component vectors). In other word, the propose of this is to make sure vectors $\Phi_{1il}^{\pm \Lambda_q}$, $\Phi_{il\sigma}^{\pm 2\Lambda_q}$, $\ldots \Phi_{il\sigma}^{\pm \Lambda_q}$, $\Phi_{jk\sigma}^{\pm \Lambda_q}$, $\ldots \Phi_{jk\sigma}^{\pm \Lambda_q}$ are orthogonal to each other.

Then there are $N^2 - 2\Lambda^{-1}_q$ eigenvectors with eigenvalues equal zero (correspond to the ground state), i.e.,

$$\text{Det}[g_q \Phi_{il\sigma}^{-q} \Phi_{j\kappa\sigma}'] = 0,$$

(45) and $2\Lambda^{-1}_q$ eigenvectors $\Phi_{\sigma} = \frac{\Phi_{1\sigma}^{-q} \pm \Phi_{2\sigma}^{-q}}{\sqrt{2}}$ with eigenvalue $\pm \frac{J}{2 \Lambda^{-1}_q \sqrt{N}}$. This can be verified by the rule that for Hermitian matrix the eigenvectors corresponding to different eigenvalues are orthogonal to each other,

$$\left(\frac{\Phi_{1\sigma}^{-q} + \Phi_{2\sigma}^{-q}}{\sqrt{2}}\right)_H \cdot \left(\frac{\Phi_{1\sigma}^{-q} - \Phi_{2\sigma}^{-q}}{\sqrt{2}}\right) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\Phi_{1\sigma}^{-q} \cdot \Phi_{1\sigma}^{-q} - \Phi_{1\sigma}^{-q} \cdot \Phi_{2\sigma}^{-q} - \Phi_{1\sigma}^{-q} \cdot \Phi_{2\sigma}^{-q} + \Phi_{2\sigma}^{-q} \cdot \Phi_{2\sigma}^{-q}\right) = 0,$$

(46) where $\Phi_{1\sigma}^{-q} \cdot \Phi_{2\sigma}^{-q} = 0$ since they are orthogonal to each other, and superscript $H$ denotes the transpose conjugation (Hermitian conjugate). The result of Eq.(35) is used here.

In the special case of $\Lambda^{-1}_q = N^2/2$, we have, in matrix $g_q \Phi_{il\sigma}{\Phi}_{j\kappa\sigma}'$, $N^2$ eigenvectors $\frac{\Phi_{1\sigma}^{-q} \pm \Phi_{2\sigma}^{-q}}{\sqrt{2}}$ with eigenvalue $\pm \frac{J \Lambda_q}{2 \sqrt{2}}$. Then processing the disorder average over $ijkl$ to $g_q \Phi_{\sigma}^{-q} \Phi_{\sigma}'$, we have the variance

$$\overline{\text{Var}}(g_q \Phi_{il\sigma}^{-q} \Phi_{j\kappa\sigma}') = (g_q \Phi_{il\sigma}^{-q} \Phi_{j\kappa\sigma}')^2 = (ig_q \Phi_{1\sigma}^{-q} \Phi_{2\kappa\sigma}' - ig_q \Phi_{2\sigma}^{-q} \Phi_{1\kappa\sigma}')^2 = \frac{1}{4} \frac{J^2 \Lambda_q}{N^2} = \frac{J^2}{2 N^4},$$

(47) since $g_q \Phi_{il\sigma}^{-q} \Phi_{j\kappa\sigma}' = 0$. Note that here the overline denotes only the disorder average over $ijkl$ index. This result is in consistent with the property of Wigner matrix in GUE

$$\overline{\lambda^2} = (\overline{g_q \Phi_{i\sigma}^{-q} \Phi_{j\kappa\sigma}'})^2 = \frac{J^2 \Lambda_q}{4 N^2} \sim O(N^{-2}),$$

(48) in contract with that in Gaussian orthogonal ensemble (GOE) which reads $O(N^{-2})(1 + \delta_{il,jk})$. Here $\lambda$ denotes the eigenvalues.

In this case, the coupling $J$ within spectral function reads

$$J^2 = 2 N^4 (g_q \Phi_{il\sigma}^{-q} \Phi_{j\kappa\sigma}')^2,$$

(49) In the $\Lambda^{-1}_q \ll N^2/2$ limit, we can easily know that $J$ is vanishingly small, and the polaronic dynamic then dominates over the SYK dynamic, and the system exhibits Fermi liquid feature. While for $0 \ll \Lambda^{-1}_q < N^2/2$, the system exhibits disordered Fermi liquid feature with sharp Landau quasiparticles, and for positive define matrix $g_q \Phi_{il\sigma}{\Phi}_{j\kappa\sigma}'$, since every zero eigenvalue corresponds to a ground state, there are $N^2 - 2\Lambda^{-1}_q$ ground states, and thus the system exhibits degeneracy $2^{N^2-2\Lambda^{-1}_q}$. While in the case of $\mu \gg g_q$, the bilinear term as a disorder will gapped out the system and lift the degeneracy in ground state, although in some certain systems[19] the near nesting of Fermi surface sheets can prevents the increase of degeneracy by disorder. Here the bilinear term is absent but the finite value of variance $\text{Var}(g_q \Phi_{il\sigma}{\Phi}_{j\kappa\sigma}')$ with $\Lambda^{-1}_q < N^2/2$ plays its role and drives the SYK non-Fermi liquid state to disordered Fermi liquid ground state.
Finally, we conclude that in $\Lambda_q^{-1} \ll N^2/2$ case, although $g_q \Phi_{il\sigma} \Phi_{jkl'}$ is a Hermitian matrix with randomly independent elements and large $N$, and each of its matrix elements follows the same distribution (distribution of Chi-square variables), the eigenvalue distribution does not follow the semicircle law. This is because, for $\Lambda_q^{-1} < N^2/2$, $N^2$-component vectors $\Phi_i^{-q}$, $\Phi_j^q$ are mutually orthogonal, i.e., $\Phi_i^q \cdot \Phi_j^q = \Phi_j^q \cdot \Phi_i^q = 0$, which leads to large degeneracy in ground state. In this case, the spectral function does not follow the semicircle law, but exhibits three broadened peaks located on the energies $\varepsilon = 0, \pm \sqrt{J \Lambda_q^{1/2}}$, with heights corresponding to the numbers of the corresponding eigenvectors.

5 SYK$_{q=2}$ polaron model in $\Lambda_q = 0$

Based on the above discussions, we further extend the $\Lambda_q^{-1} \to \infty$ SYK limit to $\Lambda_q = 0$ case, i.e., the SYK$_{q=2}$ model. This is the limit that does not allow any polaron to exist, and now $\Phi_i$, $\Phi_j$ are no longer Gaussian variables since $\phi_i$ can be treated the same as $\phi_k$, but $\Phi_i^q \Phi_j^q$ (and $\Phi_{ik}$ as defined below) becomes a Gaussian variable, and the matrix $g_q \Phi_{il\sigma} \Phi_{jkl'}$ follows Gaussian distribution. The Hamiltonian can now be reconstructed as

$$H_p = -g_q \sum_{ijkl} \Phi_i^q \Phi_j^q \Phi_{k\sigma} \Phi_{l\sigma} c_i^\dagger c_j^\dagger c_k^\dagger c_l^\dagger$$

$$= -g_q \sum_{ijkl} \Phi_i^q c_i^\dagger c_k^\dagger (\Phi_{ik}^q c_i^\dagger c_k^\dagger)^*$$

$$= -g_q \sum_{ijkl} (\Phi_i^q c_i^\dagger c_k^\dagger)^2,$$

where $\Phi_i^q = \Phi_i$, and $\Phi_{ij} = 0$, $\Phi_{jl} = 0$. Then since $g_p < 0$ for attractive polaron, we obtain that the eigenvalue of $H_p$ is positive. This guarantees the Gaussian distribution of $\sqrt{|g_q|} \Phi_{ik}$ and $\sqrt{|g_p|} \Phi_{jl}$, with deviation reads

$$\sum_{i>k} g_q \Phi_{ik}^2 = \sum_{j>l} g_q \Phi_{jl}^2 = g_q \Phi_{ik}^2 \frac{N(N-1)}{2}$$

$$= \frac{J}{2(N^{1/4})^2(\sqrt{N-1})^{1/2}} \frac{N(N-1)}{2} = \frac{J}{2 N^{1/2}(N-1)^{1/2}} \frac{N(N-1)}{2}$$

$$\approx \frac{J}{2N} \frac{N(N-1)}{4}.$$  (51)

Then the Euclidean time path integral reads

$$Z = \int D[c^\dagger, c^\dagger] e^{-S}$$

$$S_0 = \int d\tau d\tau' \left[ \sum_i c_i^\dagger(\tau) \partial_{\tau}(\tau - \tau') c_i(\tau) + \sum_k c_k^\dagger(\tau) \partial_{\tau}(\tau - \tau') c_k(\tau') \right],$$

$$S_{int} = \int d\tau d\tau' \left[ -g_q \sum_{ik} \Phi_i^q c_i^\dagger c_k^\dagger (\Phi_{ik}^q c_i^\dagger c_k^\dagger)^* \right].$$
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Using the replica trick $\bar{\ln Z} = \lim_{n \to 0} \frac{\ln Z}{n}$ the Gaussian average, we have

$$Z = \int D[c_i^1, c] e^{-\int d\tau d\tau' \left[ \sum_i c_i^1(\tau) \partial_\tau \delta(\tau - \tau') c_i(\tau) + \sum_k c_k^1(\tau) \partial_\tau \delta(\tau - \tau') c_k(\tau) - g_q^{-1} \psi_1(\tau) \psi_2(\tau') \right]}$$

$$\int D[\Phi_{ik}, \Phi_{ik}^*] e^{-\int d\tau d\tau' (i\psi_1 \Phi_{ik} c_k^1 c_k + i\psi_2 \Phi_{ik}^* c_k^1 c_k - H.c.)}$$

$$\int D[\Phi_{ik}, \Phi_{ik}^*] e^{-\frac{[\Phi_{ik}]^2}{\sigma^2} - \frac{[\Phi_{ik}^*]^2}{\sigma^2}}$$

$$= \int D[c_i^1, c] e^{-\int d\tau d\tau' \left[ \sum_i c_i^1(\tau) \partial_\tau \delta(\tau - \tau') c_i(\tau) + \sum_k c_k^1(\tau) \partial_\tau \delta(\tau - \tau') c_k(\tau) - g_q^{-1} \psi_1(\tau) \psi_2(\tau') \right]}$$

$$\int D[\Phi_{ik}, \Phi_{ik}^*] e^{-\int d\tau d\tau' (i\psi_1 \Phi_{ik} c_k^1 c_k + i\psi_2 \Phi_{ik}^* c_k^1 c_k - H.c.)}$$

$$\int D[\Phi_{ik}, \Phi_{ik}^*] e^{-\frac{[\Phi_{ik}]^2}{\sigma^2} - \frac{[\Phi_{ik}^*]^2}{\sigma^2}},$$

(53)

where $\sigma^2 = \frac{\langle \Phi_{ik}^2 \rangle}{2}$ is the variance of Gaussian variable $\Phi_{ik}$.

Since

$$\int d\Phi_{ik} d\Phi_{ik}^* e^{-\frac{[\Phi_{ik}]^2}{\sigma^2} - \frac{[\Phi_{ik}^*]^2}{\sigma^2} - (i\psi_1 \Phi_{ik} c_k^1 c_k + H.c.)}$$

$$= \int d\Phi_{ik} d\Phi_{ik}^* e^{-\frac{[\Phi_{ik}]^2}{\sigma^2} - \frac{[\Phi_{ik}^*]^2}{\sigma^2} - (i\psi_1 \Phi_{ik} c_k^1 c_k - i\psi_2 \Phi_{ik}^* c_k^1 c_k)}$$

$$= \int d\Phi_{ik} d\Phi_{ik}^* e^{-\frac{[\Phi_{ik}]^2}{\sigma^2} - \frac{[\Phi_{ik}^*]^2}{\sigma^2} (\Phi_{ik}^2 + \sigma^2 \psi_1^2 c_k^1 c_k + \Phi_{ik}^* c_k^1 c_k)} e^{\sigma^2 (\psi_1^*(\tau) \psi_1(\tau') c_k^1(\tau) c_k(\tau') + \psi_2^*(\tau) \psi_2(\tau') c_k^1(\tau) c_k(\tau') + \partial_\tau c_k^1(\tau) c_k(\tau') + c_k^1(\tau) c_k(\tau') + \partial_\tau c_k^1(\tau) c_k(\tau') c_k(\tau') + c_k^1(\tau) c_k(\tau') c_k(\tau'}).$$

(54)

the action can be written as

$$S = \int d\tau d\tau' \left[ \sum_i c_i^1(\tau) \partial_\tau \delta(\tau - \tau') c_i(\tau) + \sum_k c_k^1(\tau) \partial_\tau \delta(\tau - \tau') c_k(\tau) - g_q^{-1} \psi_1(\tau) \psi_2(\tau') - g_q^{-1} \psi_2(\tau) \psi_1(\tau') \right]$$

$$- \int d\tau d\tau' \sigma^2 (\psi_1^*(\tau) \psi_1(\tau') c_k^1(\tau) c_k(\tau') + c_k^1(\tau) c_k(\tau') - \int d\tau d\tau' \sigma^2 (\psi_1^*(\tau) \psi_1(\tau') c_k^1(\tau) c_k(\tau') c_k(\tau') - \int d\tau d\tau' \sigma^2 (\psi_1^*(\tau) \psi_1(\tau') c_k^1(\tau) c_k(\tau') c_k(\tau') - \int d\tau d\tau' \sigma^2 (\psi_1^*(\tau) \psi_1(\tau') c_k^1(\tau) c_k(\tau') c_k(\tau') - \int d\tau d\tau' \sigma^2 (\psi_1^*(\tau) \psi_1(\tau') c_k^1(\tau) c_k(\tau') c_k(\tau') - \int d\tau d\tau' \sigma^2 (\psi_1^*(\tau) \psi_1(\tau') c_k^1(\tau) c_k(\tau') c_k(\tau') - \int d\tau d\tau' \sigma^2 (\psi_1^*(\tau) \psi_1(\tau') c_k^1(\tau) c_k(\tau') c_k(\tau') + (N - 1) \Sigma^2 (\tau, \tau') \right]$$

(55)

Defining $g_{loc}(\tau, \tau') = N^{-1} \sum_i c_i^1(\tau) c_i(\tau)$ in mean field treatment, and using the identity

$$1 = \int D\Sigma Dg_{loc}(N \int d\tau d\tau' \Sigma(\tau, \tau') g_{loc}(\tau, \tau') - \frac{1}{N} \sum_i c_i^1(\tau) c_i(\tau)$$

(56)

we obtain

$$S = - (2N - 1) \int d\tau d\tau' \ln [\partial_\tau + \Sigma(\tau, \tau')] - \int d\tau d\tau' \ln \left( \begin{array}{cc} 0 & -g_q^{-1} \\ -g_q^{-1} & 0 \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{c} \psi_1^* \\ \psi_2 \end{array} \right)$$

$$- \int d\tau d\tau' \frac{(N - 1)J}{2} \psi_1^*(\tau) \psi_1(\tau') g_{loc}(\tau, \tau') - \int d\tau d\tau' \frac{(N - 1)J}{2} \psi_2^*(\tau) \psi_2(\tau') g_{loc}(\tau, \tau') + (2N - 1) \Sigma(\tau, \tau') g_{loc}(\tau', \tau),$$

(57)
thus
\[
\frac{\partial S}{\partial \Sigma(\tau', \tau)} = (2N - 1)g_{\text{loc}}(\tau, \tau') - \frac{2N - 1}{-i\omega + \Sigma(\tau, \tau')},
\]
\[
\frac{\partial S}{\partial g_{\text{loc}}(\tau', \tau)} = (2N - 1)\psi_1^*(\tau)\psi_1(\tau')g_{\text{loc}}(\tau', \tau) - \frac{J(N - 1)}{2}\psi_2^*(\tau)\psi_2(\tau')g_{\text{loc}}(\tau', \tau).
\]
(58)

In the above equation Eq.(53), we use the relation
\[
e^{g_q^2\Phi_{ik}\Phi_{ik}^*} = \int D[\psi]e^{g_q^2\psi_2 - i\psi_1\Phi_{ik} - i\psi_2\Phi_{ik}^*},
\]
(59)
since
\[
\int D[\psi]e^{g_q^2(\psi_i - i\Phi_{ik})^2} = 1.
\]
(60)
Then according to another identity
\[
\int D[\psi]e^{-\int d\tau d\tau'(-ig_q\psi_1(\tau')\psi_2(\tau'))} = e^{\text{Trln}(-ig_q)} = 1,
\]
(61)
we have
\[
\int d\tau d\tau'(ig_q\psi_1(\tau')\psi_2(\tau')) = \int d\tau d\tau'g_q^{-1}(\psi_1(\tau) - i\Phi_{ik}^*(\tau')g_q)(\psi_2(\tau') - i\Phi_{ik}(\tau)g_q).
\]
(62)
In this case ($\Lambda_q = 0$), $|g_q| \equiv g \to \infty$ which corresponds to the tightly bounded particles, and the polaron system is in ground state with zero energy, and the zero eigenstate (of matrix element $\Phi_{ik}$) corresponds to zero density-of-states since
\[
D(\varepsilon = 0) = \rho(\varepsilon = 0) = 2^{N/2}\sqrt{\frac{1}{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{\sum_{i>k}|\Phi_{ik}|^2}} = 2^{N/2}\sqrt{\frac{2}{J(N - 1)\pi}} \to 0 \text{ (J \to \infty)},
\]
(63)
where $2^{N/2}$ is the number of states for $N$ pair of fermions (or $N$ polaron modes; each mode contains four fermions and $N/2$ corresponds to number of creation operators). Here the eigenstates follows the Gaussian distribution. This is different with the $g_q > 0$ (repulsive polaron) case, in which case the eigenvalues are negative and follows the semicircle law distribution. In repulsive polaron case, the mean value of maximum eigenvalue (a summation over all $2^{N/2}$ states) of $H_p$ is $(\frac{4J^2}{\varpi})^2$ according to Eq.(39), where $J = 2N\Phi_{ik}^2$. To obtain the ground state entropy, we firstly write the partition function as
\[
Z = \text{Tr}e^{-\beta H_p} = \int d\varepsilon \rho(\varepsilon) e^{-\beta\varepsilon^2}
\]
\[
= \int_0^\infty d\varepsilon 2^{N/2}\sqrt{\frac{2}{J(N - 1)\pi}} e^{-\frac{\varepsilon^2}{2J(N - 1)\pi}} e^{-\beta\varepsilon^2}
\]
\[
= 2^{-1+(1+N)/2}\sqrt{\frac{1}{J(N-1)}} \frac{2}{\beta + \frac{2}{J(N-1)}},
\]
(64)
then the entropy density reads

\[ S = \frac{1}{N} \left( \frac{\partial \bar{\varepsilon}^2}{\partial T} + \frac{-\partial F}{\partial T} \right) = \frac{1}{N} \left( \ln Z + T \frac{\partial \ln Z}{\partial T} \right) = \frac{1}{N} \left( \ln Z - \beta \frac{\partial \ln Z}{\partial \beta} \right) \]

\[ = \frac{\beta^2 2^{-1+(-1-N)/2+(1+N)/2}}{\left( \beta + \frac{2}{J(N-1)} \right) N} + \ln \frac{2^{-1+(1+N)/2} \sqrt{1}}{\sqrt{\beta + \frac{2}{J(N-1)}}}, \tag{65} \]

where \( \bar{\varepsilon}^2 = \frac{\sum_{i} \varepsilon_i^2 e^{-\beta \varepsilon_i^2}}{Z} \) is the average energy of Hamiltonian \( H_p \) and \( f = \frac{F}{N} = -\frac{T \ln Z}{N} \) is the free energy density, and we found

\[ \lim_{N \to \infty} S = \frac{\ln 2}{2}. \tag{66} \]

This nonzero ground state entropy does not related to the temperature, which is an important feature of SYK system. The specific heat can be obtained as

\[ C_v = -\beta \frac{\partial S}{\partial \beta} = \frac{\beta^2 2^{-1+(-1-N)/2+(1+N)/2}}{\left( \beta + \frac{2}{J(N-1)} \right) N}. \tag{67} \]

And the heat capacity can be obtained as

\[ C_p = \frac{\partial f}{\partial T} = \frac{\partial F}{N \partial T} = -T \frac{\partial \ln Z}{N \partial T} = \frac{\beta \partial \ln Z}{N \partial \beta} = -\frac{\beta^2 2^{-1+(-1-N)/2+(1+N)/2}}{\left( \beta + \frac{2}{J(N-1)} \right) N}. \tag{68} \]

For \( N \times N \) matrix \( \Phi_{ik} \) with large \( N \), it is a Gaussian Wigner matrix as its each matrix elements are randomly independent and follows the Gaussian distribution, unlike the above \( N^2 \times N^2 \) matrix \( \Phi_{il} \Phi_{jk} \) whose matrix elements (Chi-square random variables) follow the Gamma distributions. But the eigenvalues of these two matrices convergent to the semicircle law which is an asymptotically free (freely independent) analogue of the central limit theorem (for scalar probability theory).

6 Conclusion

The discussion of this paper base on an important quantity: the polaronic momentum \( q \), which is also the relative momentum during scattering between impurity and majority particles (or holes). The polaron forms at the pole of scattering amplitude where \( q = ia^{-1} \), where \( a \) is the
scattering length, and the quantity $q a$ becomes an important characteristic scale in predicting the many-body behaviors. Note that we works on the condition that close to the half-filling with cutoff $\Lambda_q^{-1} \to \infty$ to satisfy the requirement of SYK physics. In such non-Fermi liquid phase, since the $q$ is small, and the coupling is strong, the polaron is not well-defined unlike in the Fermi liquid phase. In the opposite limit with $\Lambda_q^{-1} \ll N^2$, as we also discuss in this paper, the system exhibits (disordered) Fermi liquid features, e.g., the sharp peaks in spectral function. While in the Fermi liquid phase with well-defined Fermi surface, the above characteristic scale should be replaced by $k_F a$ where $k_F$ is the Fermi wave vector.

7 Appendix.A

For fully antisymmetry tensor $J_{ijkl}$ with indices $i, j, k, l = 1 \cdots N$, if we do not restrict the indices $i, j, k, l$ are different to each other (although that would leads to shift of particle-hole symmetry point away from $\mu = 0$), then the ratio of

$$\alpha_{q=4} = \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{ijkl} J_{ijkl}}{\sum_{i<j<k<l} J_{ijkl}}$$

(69)

can be obtained as

$$\alpha_{q=4} = \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N^q} \sum_{i=1}^{N-(q-1)} \sum_{a=0}^{N-i-q+1} (a+1)(N-i-q+2-a)$$

(70)

That is also why Eq.(71) can also be written as $\frac{J_{ijkl}}{4N^4}$, which is consistent with the prefactors given by us (Eq.(70) and Eq.(71)). And similarly, we can obtain

$$\alpha_{q=2} = \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{ij} J_{ij}}{\sum_{i<j} J_{ij}} = \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N^q} \sum_{i=1}^{N-(q-1)} (N-i) = \frac{1}{2}$$

$$\alpha_{q=4} = \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{ijkl} J_{ijkl}}{\sum_{ijkl} J_{ijkl}} = \frac{1}{4}.$$  

(71)

8 Appendix.B: Replica approach in solving SYK$_{q=2}$×SYK$_{q=2}$×SYK$_{q'=1}$

Hamiltonian $H_p$

For small but finite $\Lambda_q$ case, the Hamiltonian $H_p$ describes a SYK$_{q=2}$×SYK$_{q=2}$×SYK$_{q'=1}$ model,

$$H_p = g_q \sum_{i,j,k,l} \sum_q \Phi_i \Phi_{jk} c_i^\dagger c_j^\dagger c_k.$$

(72)

The disorder average over $ijkl$ and $q$ will be done in the same time.

Firstly, the Euclidean time path integral reads

$$Z = \int D[c^\dagger, c] e^{-S},$$

$$S_0 = \int d\tau d\tau' \left[ \sum_i c_i^\dagger(\tau) \delta(\tau - \tau') c_i(\tau') \right],$$

(73)

$$S_{int} = \int d\tau d\tau' \left[ g_q \sum_{i,j,k,l} \sum_q \Phi_i \Phi_{jk} c_i^\dagger c_j^\dagger c_k. $$
Using the replica trick $\ln Z = \lim_{n \to 0} \frac{\ln Z}{n}$ the Gaussian average, we have

$$Z = \int D[c^\dagger, c] \sum_q e^{-\int d\tau d\tau'[c^\dagger_i(\tau)\partial_\tau \delta(\tau-\tau')c_i(\tau)+g_q^{-1}b_i^{-q}b_i^q]} \int D[\Phi_d, \Phi^*_d] \sum_q e^{-\frac{|q|^2|\Phi_d|^2}{\sigma^2}}$$

$$\int D[\Phi_{jk}, \Phi^*_{jk}] \sum_q e^{-\frac{|q|^2|\Phi_{jk}|^2}{\sigma^2}}$$

$$\int D[\Phi_d, \Phi^*_d] \int D[\Phi_{jk}, \Phi^*_{jk}] \sum_q e^{-\int d\tau d\tau'[i\Phi_d^{-q}c^\dagger_i b_i^{-q}+i\Phi_d^{-q}c^\dagger_i b_i^q]}$$

where $\sigma^2 = \overline{\Phi_{\eta \kappa}}$ is the variance of Gaussian variable $\Phi_{\eta \kappa}$, and $D[\Phi_d, \Phi^*_d] = \prod_j d\Phi_d d\Phi^*_d$, $D[\Phi_{jk}, \Phi^*_{jk}] = \prod_{jk} d\Phi_{jk} d\Phi^*_{jk}$, $D[c^\dagger_i, c_i] = \prod_i dc^\dagger_i dc_i$. Note that here within the Gaussian average, the Gaussian distribution should be $e^{-\frac{|q_{jk}|^2}{\sigma^2}}$ instead of $e^{-\frac{|q_{jk}|^2}{2\sigma^2}}$, because the factor 2 in the denominator has in fact already been considered in the replica process by observable $O$ (see, e.g., Eq.(3)). Here $\sigma^2 = \overline{\Phi_{\eta \kappa}^2} = \frac{d}{2N} 2\Lambda_q = \frac{d}{N}\Lambda_q$. And here we use the identity

$$\int D[a] e^{-ga_1 a_2 \cdots a_n} = \int D[a] \int D[b] e^{-g^{-1}b_1 b_2 \cdots b_{n-1} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} b_\alpha a_\alpha},$$

(75)

to decouple the two Gaussian variables. This relies on the identity

$$\int D[b] e^{-g^{-1}(b+iag)^n} = 1.$$  

(76)

Since

$$\int d\Phi_d d\Phi^*_d e^{-\frac{|q|^2}{\sigma^2}} e^{-(i\Phi_d^{-q}c^\dagger_i b_i^{-q}+H.c.)} = \int d\Phi_d d\Phi^*_d e^{-\frac{|q|^2}{\sigma^2}} e^{-(i\Phi_d^{-q}c^\dagger_i b_i^{-q}-i\Phi_d^{-q}c^\dagger_i b_i^{-q})}$$

$$= \int d\Phi_d d\Phi^*_d e^{-\frac{|q|^2}{\sigma^2}} e^{-(i\Phi_d^{-q}c^\dagger_i b_i^{-q})(\Phi^*_d)^{-q})} e^{\sigma^2(b^{-q}_i c^\dagger_i)(b^{-q}_i c^\dagger_i)}$$

$$= e^{\sigma^2(b^{-q}_i c^\dagger_i)(b^{-q}_i c^\dagger_i)},$$

(77)

similarly,

$$\int d\Phi_{jk} d\Phi^*_{jk} e^{-\frac{|q|^2}{\sigma^2}} e^{-(i\Phi_{jk} c^\dagger_i b_i^q+H.c.)} = e^{\sigma^2(b^q_j c^\dagger_i)(b^q_j c^\dagger_i)}.$$  

(78)

then the action can be written as

$$S = \int d\tau d\tau'[\sum_i c^\dagger_i(\tau)\partial_\tau \delta(\tau-\tau')c_i(\tau) + \sum_q g_q^{-1}b_i^{-q}(\tau)b_i^q(\tau') + \sum_q g_q^{-1}b_i^{-q}(\tau)b_i^q(\tau')]$$

$$- \int d\tau d\tau' \sum_q \sigma^2(b^{-q}_i c^\dagger_i c_i)(b^{-q}_i c^\dagger_i c_i)^* - \int d\tau d\tau' \sum_q \sigma^2(b^q_j c^\dagger_i c_k)(b^q_j c^\dagger_i c_k)^*$$

$$= \int d\tau d\tau'[\sum_i c^\dagger_i(\tau)\partial_\tau \delta(\tau-\tau')c_i(\tau) + \sum_q g_q^{-1}b_i^{-q}(\tau)b_i^q(\tau')]$$

$$- \int d\tau d\tau' \sum_q \frac{J_N}{N}(b^{-q}_i c^\dagger_i c_i)(b^{-q}_i c^\dagger_i c_i)^* - \int d\tau d\tau' \sum_q \frac{J_N}{N}(b^q_j c^\dagger_i c_k)(b^q_j c^\dagger_i c_k)^*.$$  

(79)
By inserting the identities (in mean-field approximation with $N \to \infty$)

\[
1 = \int Dg_{\text{loc}}[g_{\text{loc}}(\tau', \tau) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_i c_i^\dagger(\tau)c_i(\tau')]
\]

\[
= \int Dg_{\text{loc}}[Ng_{\text{loc}}(\tau', \tau) - \sum_i c_i^\dagger(\tau)c_i(\tau')]
\]

\[
= \int Dg_{\text{loc}}D\Sigma\exp[N\Sigma(\tau, \tau')g_{\text{loc}}(\tau', \tau) - \Sigma(\tau, \tau')\sum_i c_i^\dagger(\tau)c_i(\tau')],
\]

\[
1 = \int D\mathcal{D}D\Pi\exp[A_q^{-1}\Pi(\tau, \tau')\mathcal{D}(\tau', \tau) - \Pi(\tau, \tau')\sum_q b_1^{\dagger q}(\tau)b_1^{-q}(\tau')],
\]

\[
1 = \int D\mathcal{D}'D\Pi'\exp[A_q^{-1}\Pi'(\tau, \tau')\mathcal{D}'(\tau', \tau) - \Pi'(\tau, \tau')\sum_q b_2^{\dagger q}(\tau)b_2^{-q}(\tau')],
\]

and the Green’s functions

\[
\mathcal{D}(\tau, \tau') = \Lambda_q \sum_q b_1^{-q^*}(\tau)b_1^{-q}(\tau'),
\]

\[
\mathcal{D}'(\tau, \tau') = \Lambda_q \sum_q b_2^{q}(\tau)b_2^{q}(\tau'),
\]

we obtain

\[
S = -4N \int d\tau d\tau' \text{Tr} \ln[\partial_\tau + \Sigma(\tau, \tau')] + \sum_q g_q^{-1}b_1^{-q}(\tau)b_1^{q^*}(\tau') + \sum_q g_q^{-1}b_2^{q}(\tau)b_2^{q}(\tau')
\]

\[
- N \int d\tau d\tau' J(-\mathcal{D}(\tau, \tau'))g_{\text{loc}}^2(\tau, \tau') - N \int d\tau d\tau' J(-\mathcal{D}'(\tau, \tau'))g_{\text{loc}}^2(\tau, \tau')
\]

\[
- \int d\tau d\tau'[A_q^{-1}\Pi(\tau, \tau')b_1^{q^*}(\tau)b_1^{-q^*}(\tau') + A_q^{-1}\Pi'(\tau, \tau')b_2^{q^*}(\tau)b_2^{-q^*}(\tau')]
\]

\[
+ \Lambda_q^{-1}\Pi(\tau, \tau')\mathcal{D}(\tau', \tau) + \Lambda_q^{-1}\Pi'(\tau, \tau')\mathcal{D}'(\tau', \tau) + 4N\Sigma(\tau, \tau')g_{\text{loc}}(\tau', \tau)
\]

\[
= -4N \int d\tau d\tau' \text{Tr} \ln[\partial_\tau + \Sigma(\tau, \tau')] - \Lambda_q^{-1} \int d\tau d\tau' \text{Tr} \ln (b_1^{-q}(\tau)b_1^{-q}(\tau')) (\Pi(\tau, \tau') g_q^{-1} g_q^{-1}) (b_1^{q^*}(\tau) b_1^{q^*}(\tau'))
\]

\[
- N \int d\tau d\tau' J(-\mathcal{D}(\tau, \tau'))g_{\text{loc}}^2(\tau, \tau') - N \int d\tau d\tau' J(-\mathcal{D}'(\tau, \tau'))g_{\text{loc}}^2(\tau, \tau')
\]

\[
+ \Lambda_q^{-1}\Pi(\tau, \tau')\mathcal{D}(\tau', \tau) + \Lambda_q^{-1}\Pi'(\tau, \tau')\mathcal{D}'(\tau', \tau) + 4N\Sigma(\tau, \tau')g_{\text{loc}}(\tau', \tau),
\]

in the case of particle-hole symmetry. Using the saddle-point equations, we obtain

\[
\frac{\partial S}{\partial \Sigma(\tau', \tau)} = 4Ng_{\text{loc}}(\tau, \tau') - \frac{4N}{-i\omega - \Sigma(\tau', \tau)} = 4Ng_{\text{loc}}(\tau, \tau') - \frac{4N}{-i\omega + \Sigma(\tau, \tau')} = 0,
\]

\[
\frac{\partial S}{\partial g_{\text{loc}}(\tau', \tau)} = 4N\Sigma(\tau, \tau') - NJ(-\mathcal{D}(\tau, \tau'))g_{\text{loc}}(\tau', \tau) - NJ(-\mathcal{D}'(\tau, \tau'))g_{\text{loc}}(\tau', \tau) = 0,
\]

\[
\frac{\partial S}{\partial \Pi(\tau', \tau)} = \Lambda_q^{-1}\mathcal{D}(\tau, \tau') - \frac{\Lambda_q^{-1}(-\Pi'(\tau, \tau'))}{\Pi(\tau, \tau')\Pi'(\tau, \tau') - g_q^2} = 0,
\]

\[
\frac{\partial S}{\partial \mathcal{D}(\tau', \tau)} = \Lambda_q^{-1}\Pi(\tau', \tau') - NJg_{\text{loc}}^2(\tau, \tau') = 0,
\]
thus
\[ g_{loc}(\tau, \tau') = \frac{1}{\partial_\tau + \Sigma(\tau, \tau')}, \]
\[ \Sigma(\tau, \tau') = -\frac{J}{4}D(\tau, \tau')g_{loc}(\tau', \tau) - \frac{J}{4}D'(\tau, \tau')g_{loc}(\tau', \tau), \]
\[ D(\tau, \tau') = -\Pi'(\tau, \tau') \]
\[ \Pi(\tau, \tau') = N \Lambda_q J g_{loc}^2(\tau, \tau'). \]

Then the free energy density can be obtained as
\[ f = \frac{F}{N \Lambda_q^{-1}} = -\frac{T}{N \Lambda_q^{-1}} (N \sum_\omega \ln(-\beta g^{-1}_{\omega}(i\omega)) + \Lambda_q^{-1} \sum_\omega \det(-\beta D^{-1}(i\omega))) \]
\[ = -\frac{1}{N \Lambda_q^{-1}} \int_0^\beta d\tau (NJ g^2(\tau) D(-\tau) + NJ g^2(\tau) D'(\tau)) \]
\[ \text{where} \]
\[ g(i\omega) = \frac{1}{i\omega - \Sigma(i\omega)}, \]
\[ g_B^{-1}(i\omega) = -
\begin{pmatrix}
\Pi(\tau, \tau') & \Pi'(\tau, \tau') \\
g_q^{-1} & g_q^{-1}
\end{pmatrix}, \]
\[ g_B(i\omega) = -
\begin{pmatrix}
\Pi'(\tau, \tau') & -g_q^{-1} \\
g_q^{-1} & \Pi(\tau, \tau')
\end{pmatrix}. \]

For first term we have
\[ \sum_\omega \ln(-\beta g^{-1}_{\omega}(i\omega)) e^{i\omega \theta^+} = \sum_\omega \ln(-\beta g^{-1}_{0}(i\omega)) e^{i\omega \theta^+} + \sum_\omega \ln(-\beta g^{-1}_{0}(i\omega)) e^{i\omega \theta^+} \]
\[ = \ln 2 - \sum_\omega \ln(1 - \frac{J}{2\beta} D(\tau, \tau') g_{loc}(\tau', \tau) e^{i\omega \theta^+}) \]
\[ \text{since at saddle point } D = D'. \]

The second term reads
\[ \sum_\omega \det(-\beta g_B^{-1}(i\omega)) = \beta^2 (\Pi^2(i\omega) - g_q^{-2}) \]
\[ = \sum_\omega \beta^2 (\Pi^2(i\omega) + (ig_q^{-1})^2). \]

9 Appendix C: Fermion density calculation base on Luttinger-Ward analysis

The fermion density at zero temperature can be calculated by
\[ n = \mathcal{Q} - \frac{1}{2} \]
\[ = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{2\pi i} g(z) e^{iz}, \]
where \(Q\) denotes the U(1) charge. Using the identity \(\partial_z(g^{-1}(z) + \Sigma(z)) = 1\), we have

\[
n = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{2\pi i} g(z)\partial_z(g^{-1}(z) + \Sigma(z))e^{\zeta_0^+} = P \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{2\pi i} g(z)\partial_z g^{-1}(z)e^{\zeta_0^+} + P \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{2\pi i} g(z)\partial_z \Sigma(z)e^{\zeta_0^+} = I_1 + I_2,
\]

where we define \(P \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} = \int_{\infty}^{\infty} + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} = \int_{\infty}^{-\infty} - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} = \int_{\infty}^{-\infty} - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\) to carry out the principal value integral along the contour., and we define the phase shift as

\[
\delta = \frac{i}{2} \log \frac{g(z + \imath \eta)}{g(z - \imath \eta)} = \frac{1}{i} \log g(z + \imath \eta) = \frac{1}{i} \log \frac{g(z - \imath \eta)}{g(z)} = -\text{Arg} g(z + \imath \eta),
\]

which equivalents to the relation \(\frac{g(z + \imath \eta)}{g(z - \imath \eta)} = e^{2i\text{Arg} g(z + \imath \eta)}\).

The integral in the first term \((I_1)\) can be rewritten as

\[
I_1 = -P \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{2\pi i} g(z)\partial_z g(z)e^{\zeta_0^+} = -P \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{2\pi i} \partial_z \log g(z)e^{\zeta_0^+} = \left( \int_{0+\imath \eta}^{\infty+\imath \eta} - \int_{0-\imath \eta}^{-\infty-\imath \eta} \right) \frac{dz}{2\pi i} \partial_z \log g(z)e^{\zeta_0^+} = -\frac{1}{\pi} \left( \text{Arg} g(\infty + \imath \eta) - \text{Arg} g(\imath \eta) \right) = -\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\theta}{\pi},
\]

where \(\text{Arg} g(\infty + \imath \eta) = 0\), \(\text{Arg} g(0 + \imath \eta) = -\frac{\pi}{2} - \theta\).

The above result can also be obtained by

\[
I_1 = -P \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{2\pi i} \partial_z \log g(z)e^{\zeta_0^+} = -P \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{2\pi i} \partial_z \log (z + \imath \eta)e^{\zeta_0^+} - P \int_{-\infty}^{0} \frac{dz}{2\pi i} \partial_z \log (z - \imath \eta)e^{\zeta_0^+} = -1 + \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\theta}{\pi} \right) = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\theta}{\pi},
\]

where \(\log g(z + \imath \eta) = -2i\text{Arg} g(z + \imath \eta)\), and

\[
-P \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{2\pi i} \partial_z \log (z + \imath \eta)e^{\zeta_0^+} = -1.
\]
Similarly,

\[ I_1 = -P \int_0^\infty \frac{dz}{2\pi i} \partial_z \ln \frac{g(z+\imath\eta)}{g(z-\imath\eta)} e^{z0} - P \int_{-\infty}^\infty \frac{dz}{2\pi i} \partial_z \ln g(z-\imath\eta) e^{z0} \]

\[ = -\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\theta}{\pi} - 0 \]

\[ = -\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\theta}{\pi}, \tag{95} \]

where \( \ln \frac{g(z+\imath\eta)}{g(z+\imath\eta)} = 2i \text{Arg} g(z + i\eta) \), and

\[ -P \int_0^\infty \frac{dz}{2\pi i} \partial_z \ln \frac{g(z+\imath\eta)}{g(z-\imath\eta)} e^{z0} = 0. \tag{96} \]

Eq.(.) and Eq.(.) can be verified by

\[ P \int_{-\infty}^\infty \frac{dz}{2\pi i} \partial_z \ln \frac{g(z+\imath\eta)}{g(z-\imath\eta)} e^{z0} = 1. \tag{97} \]

Then we turn to equation \( I_2 \)

\[ I_2 = P \int_{-i\infty}^{i\infty} \frac{dz}{2\pi i} \rho g(z) \partial_z \Sigma(z) e^{z0}. \tag{98} \]

According to above section and Appendix.B, the self-energy is

\[ \Sigma(\tau) \sim D_1(\tau) g(-\tau) + D_2(\tau) g(-\tau), \tag{99} \]

where \( D \) and \( g \) denote the boson and fermion Green’s function, respectively. In frequency domain the self-energy reads

\[ \Sigma(z) = -\int d\Omega_1 \int_\infty^\infty \frac{d\nu}{2\pi} \rho_B(\Omega_1) \rho_F(\nu) \Omega_1 Z - \nu + (\Omega_1 \leftrightarrow \Omega_2) \]

\[ = \int d\Omega_1 \int_{-\infty}^\infty \frac{d\nu}{2\pi} \rho_B(\Omega_1) \rho_F(\nu) (\text{sgn}[\Omega_1] + \text{sgn}[\nu]) + (\Omega_1 \leftrightarrow \Omega_2), \tag{100} \]

where \( \rho_B \) and \( \rho_F \) denote the boson and fermion spectral function, respectively, and it requires \( \text{sgn} [\Omega] = \text{sgn} [\nu] \). Thus \( I_2 \) can be rewritten as

\[ I_2 = P \int_{-i\infty}^{i\infty} \frac{dz}{2\pi i} e^{z0} \int \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \rho_F(\omega) \int d\Omega_1 \int_\infty^\infty \frac{d\nu}{2\pi} \frac{\rho_B(\Omega_1) \rho_F(\nu)}{Z - \Omega_1 - \nu} (\text{sgn}[\Omega_1] + \text{sgn}[\nu]) + (\Omega_1 \leftrightarrow \Omega_2). \tag{101} \]

This expression is equivalent to

\[ I_2 = P \int_{i\infty}^{i\infty} \frac{d(-z)}{2\pi i} e^{-z0} \int_\infty^{i\infty} \frac{d(-\omega)}{2\pi} \frac{\rho_F(-\omega)}{-z + \omega} \int_\infty^{i\infty} \frac{d(-\Omega_1)}{2\pi} \rho_B(-\Omega_1) \rho_F(-\nu) \frac{Z - \Omega_1 - \nu}{(-z + \Omega_1 + \nu)^2} (\text{sgn}[\Omega_1] - \text{sgn}[\nu]) + (\Omega_1 \leftrightarrow \Omega_2) \]

\[ = P \int_{-i\infty}^{i\infty} \frac{dz}{2\pi i} e^{-z0} \int_{-\infty}^{i\infty} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \frac{\rho_F(-\omega)}{z - \omega} \int_{-\infty}^{i\infty} \frac{d\nu}{2\pi} \rho_B(-\Omega_1) \rho_F(-\nu) \frac{Z - \Omega_1 - \nu}{(z - \Omega_1 - \nu)^2} (\text{sgn}[\Omega_1] + \text{sgn}[\nu]) + (\Omega_1 \leftrightarrow \Omega_2). \tag{102} \]
This can also be written as

\[ I_2 = -P \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{2\pi i} e^{-z^2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \rho_F(\omega) \frac{d\Omega_1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\nu}{2\pi} \rho_B(-\Omega_1) \rho_F(-\nu) \left( sgn[\Omega_1] + sgn[\nu] \right) + (\Omega_1 \leftrightarrow \Omega_2) \]

\[ = P \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{2\pi i} e^{-z^2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \rho_F(-\omega) \frac{d\Omega_1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\nu}{2\pi} \rho_B(\Omega_1) \rho_F(\nu) \left( sgn[\Omega_1] + sgn[\nu] \right) + (\Omega_1 \leftrightarrow \Omega_2), \]

or

\[ I_2 = P \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{2\pi i} e^{-z^2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \rho_F(-\omega) \frac{d\Omega_1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\nu}{2\pi} \rho_B(-\Omega_1) \rho_F(-\nu) \left( sgn[\Omega_1] + sgn[\nu] \right) + (\Omega_1 \leftrightarrow \Omega_2). \]

According to the above four equations, we have

\[ I_2 = \frac{1}{4} (2I_1 + 2I_2) \]

\[ = \frac{1}{4} \left[ P \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{2\pi i} e^{-z^2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \rho_F(\omega) \rho_B(-\Omega_1) \rho_F(-\nu) + \rho_F(-\omega) \rho_B(-\Omega_1) \rho_F(-\nu) \left( sgn[\Omega_1] + sgn[\nu] \right) + (\Omega_1 \leftrightarrow \Omega_2) \right] \]

\[ + \frac{1}{4} \left[ P \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{2\pi i} e^{-z^2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \rho_F(-\omega) \rho_B(-\Omega_1) \rho_F(-\nu) + \rho_F(-\omega) \rho_B(-\Omega_1) \rho_F(-\nu) \left( sgn[\Omega_1] + sgn[\nu] \right) + (\Omega_1 \leftrightarrow \Omega_2) \right]. \]

(105)

To further process, we need to know the detail form of spectral functions as well as the conformal solutions of the corresponding Green’s function. According to Eq. (3) by rewriting the boson operators as

\[ b_1^{-q}(\tau) = c_1^i(\tau)c_1(\tau), \]

\[ b_2^{-q}(\tau) = c_2^i(\tau)c_2(\tau), \]

we found the self-energy \( \Sigma(\tau) \sim -J q^2(\tau) g(-\tau) \), which is the same as the self-energy of SYK\(_{q=4}\) model. Thus the self-energy (as well as Green’s function in conformal limit) of SYK\(_{q=2}\times\)SYK\(_{q=2}\) model is equivalence to the SYK\(_{q=4}\) model except the SYK coupling constant. This relies on the construction of auxiliary boson propagator during the decoupling procedure, and it is not an universally result, e.g., the self-energy (as well as Green’s function in conformal limit) of SYK\(_{q=4}\times\)SYK\(_{q=4}\) model will not the same with the SYK\(_{q=8}\) model.

Then the imaginary time Green’s function in low temperature limit (\( \omega > \beta \)) has the form

\[ g(\tau) \sim \sqrt{\frac{T}{\sin \pi T \tau}} ; \]

(107)

instead of the Fermi liquid form which is

\[ g_{FL}(\tau) \sim \frac{T}{\sin \pi T \tau} ; \]

(108)
Also, the density-of-states in fermi liquid phase is independent of frequency, while the density-of-states described in Eq. is independent of frequency only in zero eigenvalue.

In zero temperature limit, we write the retarded Green’s functions and the corresponding self-energy as

\[
g_R(\omega) = C e^{-i(\pi/4+\theta)\omega^{1/2} J^{1/4} 2^{-1/2}},
\]

\[
\Sigma_R(\omega) = \frac{-e^{i(\pi/4+\theta)}}{C\omega^{-1/2} J^{1/4} 2^{1/2}}.
\]

For large \(\Lambda_q^{-1}\), which corresponds to large \(q\), the boson propagator can be written as

\[
D_R(\omega) \approx \frac{-1}{\Pi(\omega)} = \frac{-\left(N\Lambda_q J^2 q_{loc}(\omega)\right)^{-1}}{\omega e^{2i(\pi/4+\theta)}} = \frac{-\omega e^{-i(\pi/4+\theta)}}{N\Lambda_q J^{1/2} C^{2/2}}.
\]

Then the spectral functions read

\[
\rho_F(\omega) = -\text{Im} g(\omega + i\eta),
\]

\[
\rho_B(\omega) = \text{Im} D(\omega + i\eta).
\]

In the above equation, the parameter \(C\) is related to the spectral asymmetry and is positive as long as the spectral function is positive. By solving this we obtain

\[
\rho_F(\pm \omega) = \frac{\sqrt{2} C \sin\left[\frac{\pi}{4} (\pi + 4\theta + \text{Arg}[J] + 2\text{Arg}[i\eta \pm \omega])\right]}{J^{1/4} \left(\eta^2 + \omega^2\right)^{1/4}},
\]

\[
\rho_B(\pm \omega) = \frac{4C^4 J^2 q^2 N^2 \left(\mp 2\eta \omega \cos[4\theta] + (\eta^2 - \omega^2) \sin[4\theta]\right)}{\left(\eta^2 + \omega^2\right)^2},
\]

where \(\text{Arg}[J] = \pi\) since \(J < 0\), and \(\text{Arg}(\omega + i\eta) = -\theta - \frac{\pi}{4}\), \(\text{Arg}(-\omega + i\eta) = -\theta - \frac{3\pi}{4}\) in the IR limit where we let \(\omega \to 0^+ \approx \eta\). Then the spectral functions can be rewritten as

\[
\rho_F(\pm \omega) = \rho_F(\omega) \rho_F(\text{sgn}[\omega]) = \frac{\sqrt{2} C \sin\left[\frac{\pi}{4} (\pi + 4\theta + \text{Arg}[J] + 2\text{Arg}[i\eta \pm \omega])\right]}{J^{1/4} \left(\eta^2 + \omega^2\right)^{1/4}},
\]

\[
\rho_B(\pm \omega) \approx \frac{4C^4 J^2 q^2 N^2 \left(\mp 2\eta \omega \cos[4\theta] + (\eta^2 - \omega^2) \sin[4\theta]\right)}{\left(\eta^2 + \omega^2\right)^2} = \rho_B(\omega) \rho_B(\text{sgn}[\omega]) = \frac{4C^4 J^2 q^2 N^2 \omega}{\left(\eta^2 + \omega^2\right)^2} \rho_B(\text{sgn}[\omega]),
\]

where

\[
\rho_F(\text{sgn}[\omega]) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{sgn}[\omega] = +, \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\cot(\frac{\pi}{4} + \frac{\theta}{2})}{\sqrt{2}}, & \text{sgn}[\omega] = -, \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\cot(\frac{\pi}{4} + \frac{\theta}{2})}{\sqrt{2}}, & \text{sgn}[\omega] = +, \\ -\text{sgn}[\omega] \left(\eta \omega \cos[4\theta]\right). & \text{sgn}[\omega] = -,
\end{cases}
\]
Thus $\rho_B(-\Omega) = -\rho_B(\Omega)$, and $I_2$ can be rewritten as

$$I_2 = \frac{1}{4}(2I_2 + 2I_2)$$

$$= \frac{1}{4} \left[P \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{2\pi i} e^{z_0} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \rho_B(\Omega_1)\rho_F(\nu) - \rho_F(-\omega)\rho_F(-\nu) \right] \frac{(\text{sgn}[\Omega_1] + \text{sgn}[\nu] + (\Omega_1 \leftrightarrow \Omega_2))}{(z-\omega)(z-\Omega_1-\nu)^2}$$

$$+ \frac{1}{4} \left[P \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{2\pi i} e^{z_0} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\Omega_1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\nu}{2\pi} \rho_B(\Omega_1)(\rho_F(-\omega)\rho_F(\nu) - \rho_F(\omega)\rho_F(-\nu)) \right] \frac{(\text{sgn}[\Omega_1] + \text{sgn}[\nu] + (\Omega_1 \leftrightarrow \Omega_2))}{(z+\omega)(z-\Omega_1-\nu)^2}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (115)

Since the integral over $z$ satisfies\(^{10}\)

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{2\pi i} e^{z_0} \frac{1}{(z-a)(z-b)^2} = \begin{cases} \text{sgn}[a](a-b)^{-2}, & ab < 0, \\ 0, & ab > 0, \end{cases}$$ \hspace{1cm} (116)

i.e., the nonzero value requires the poles of Green’s functions not in the same half-plane, but locates in the opposite sides with respect to the real axis. Thus we can obtain

$$I_2 = \frac{1}{4} \left[P \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{2\pi i} e^{z_0} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\Omega_1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\nu}{2\pi} \rho_B(\Omega_1)\rho_F(\nu)\rho_F(\nu) \text{(sgn} = +) \rho_F(\nu) \text{(sgn} =-) - \rho_F(\nu)\rho_F(\nu) \text{(sgn} = +) \rho_F(\nu) \text{(sgn} =-) \right] \frac{(\text{sgn}[\Omega_1] + \text{sgn}[\nu] + (\Omega_1 \leftrightarrow \Omega_2))}{(z-\omega)(z-\Omega_1-\nu)^2}$$

$$+ \frac{1}{4} \left[P \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{2\pi i} e^{z_0} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\Omega_1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\nu}{2\pi} \rho_B(\Omega_1)\rho_F(\nu)\rho_F(\nu) \text{(sgn} = +) \rho_F(\nu) \text{(sgn} =-) - \rho_F(\nu)\rho_F(\nu) \text{(sgn} = +) \rho_F(\nu) \text{(sgn} =-) \right] \frac{(\text{sgn}[\Omega_1] + \text{sgn}[\nu] + (\Omega_1 \leftrightarrow \Omega_2))}{(z+\omega)(z-\Omega_1-\nu)^2}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (117)

For the first term, since non-zero value of $I_2$ requires $\text{sgn}[\Omega_1] = \text{sgn}[\nu]$, and non-zero value of integral over $z$ requires $\text{sgn}[\omega] = -(\text{sgn}[\Omega_1] + \text{sgn}[\nu])$, thus we have $\text{sgn}[\omega] = -\text{sgn}[\nu]$. While for the second term, since non-zero value of $I_2$ requires $\text{sgn}[\Omega_1] = \text{sgn}[\nu]$, and non-zero value of integral over $z$ requires $\text{sgn}[\omega] = (\text{sgn}[\Omega_1] + \text{sgn}[\nu])$, thus we have $\text{sgn}[\omega] = \text{sgn}[\nu]$. Then since $\rho_F(\text{sgn} = +) \rho_F(\text{sgn} = -) - \rho_F(\text{sgn} = +) \rho_F(\text{sgn} = -) = 0$, $I_2 = 0$. Thus the final result of fermion density is $n = -\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\beta}{\pi}$, which is different from the result of SYK\(_{q=4}\) model. While the global $U(1)$ charge reads $Q = -\frac{2}{\pi}$, which is tunable by turning the chemical potential (through asymmetry parameter $\beta$).

Lastly, we discuss that the exact result of parameter $C$ in the conformal solutions (Eq.(1)-(1)) is unavailable. By transforming the fermion self-energy in Eq.(114) to frequency domain, we have

$$\Sigma(i\omega) = \int_0^\beta e^{i\omega\tau} \Sigma(\tau) = -\frac{J}{4\beta} \sum_{\Omega_1} D(\Omega_1)g(\Omega_1 - \omega) - \frac{J}{4\beta} \sum_{\Omega_2} D'(\Omega_2)g(\Omega_2 - \omega).$$  \hspace{1cm} (118)
Here the power-law form of Green’s function reads (note that $1/\sqrt{\pm i} = e^{\mp i\pi/4}$)

$$g(\pm i\omega) = Ce^{\mp i\pi/4}e^{\mp i\pi/4} = Ce^{\mp i\pi/4}e^{\mp i\pi/4}$$

(119)

with

$$C = \left(\frac{2\pi}{e^{2i\theta} + e^{-2i\theta}}\right)^{1/4}.$$  

(120)

The above Green’s function can rewritten as ($e^{\mp i\pi/2} = \mp i$)

$$g(\pm i\omega) = e^{\mp i\theta}e^{\mp i\pi/4}e^{\mp i\pi/4}$$

(121)

where $\omega_{NFL}$ is the non-Fermi liquid scale below which the system enters Fermi liquid regime and with $\omega > |\Sigma|$ (i.e., the non-Fermi liquid SYK physics requires $\omega < \omega_{NFL}$), and reads

$$\omega_{NFL}^{-1/2} = (\sqrt{2\pi}e^{2i\theta} + e^{-2i\theta})^{1/4} \times J^{1/4}/2^{1/2} \propto \sqrt{\alpha/\mu},$$

(122)

where $\alpha = \tan\theta$. Close to the half-filling, after series expansion we obtain

$$g(i\omega) = (-\text{sgn} \omega - \alpha)\omega_{NFL}^{-1/2}$$

(123)

Then the conformal solution of boson Green’s function reads

$$\mathcal{D}(i\Omega) = -\frac{1}{J\Lambda_q N (\frac{2\pi}{e^{2i\theta} + e^{-2i\theta}} - \frac{2\pi}{e^{2i\theta} + e^{-2i\theta}})}.$$  

(124)

Here the boson Green’s function does not have a dressed (dynamical) bosonic mass, thus it is in the quantum critical regime and has an instability towards some ordering. By substituting the above expressions of Fermion and boson Green’s function into Eq.(), we obtain

$$\Sigma(i\omega) = -J^{1/4}(-\omega - \text{Re[}\Lambda])(-2\omega + \text{Re[}\Lambda]) + \sqrt{-\omega + \text{Re[}\Lambda]}(2\omega + \text{Re[}\Lambda]))$$

(125)

which is in consistent with the conformal relation

$$\Sigma(i\omega) = -g^{-1}(i\omega) = \frac{\sqrt{\omega}}{\sqrt{2\pi}^{1/4}(i + \alpha)}.$$  

(126)

We note that in this case, the above quantities satisfy the Baym-Kadanoff equations, which reads (at half-filling)

$$\int_0^\beta d\tau''g(\tau, \tau'')\Sigma(\tau'', \tau') = -\partial_\tau g(\tau, \tau') = -\delta(\tau - \tau'),$$

(127)

$$\int_0^\beta d\tau''\mathcal{D}(\tau, \tau'')\Pi(\tau'', \tau') = -\partial_\tau \mathcal{D}(\tau, \tau') = -\delta(\tau - \tau').$$
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