We present a review of the Sachdev-Ye-Kitaev (SYK) model of compressible quantum many-body systems without quasiparticle excitations, and its connections to various theoretical studies of non-Fermi liquids in condensed matter physics. The review is placed in the context of numerous experimental observations on correlated electron materials. Strong correlations in metals are often associated with their proximity to a Mott transition to an insulator created by the local Coulomb repulsion between the electrons. We explore the phase diagrams of a number of models of such local electronic correlation, employing a dynamical mean field theory in the presence of random spin exchange interactions. Numerical analyses and analytical solutions, using renormalization group methods and expansions in large spin degeneracy, lead to critical regions which display SYK physics. The models studied include the single-band Hubbard model, the $t$-$J$ model and the two-band Kondo-Heisenberg model in the presence of random spin exchange interactions. We also examine non-Fermi liquids obtained by considering each SYK model with random four-fermion interactions to be a multi-orbital atom, with the SYK-atoms arranged in an infinite lattice. We connect to theories of sharp Fermi surfaces without any low-energy quasiparticles in the absence of spatial disorder, obtained by coupling a Fermi liquid to a gapless boson; a systematic large $N$ theory of such a critical Fermi surface, with SYK characteristics, is obtained by averaging over an ensemble
of theories with random boson-fermion couplings. Finally, we present an overview of the links between the SYK model and quantum gravity and end with an outlook on open questions.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this review is to present some recent advances in describing quantum phases of matter that do not host any quasiparticle excitations. Much has been understood theoretically in recent years about the properties of a solvable model of a many-body quantum system without quasiparticle excitations in the regime of strong interactions: the Sachdev-Ye-Kitaev (SYK) model. We will review some of these advances in this article, along with a discussion of the application of these advances to more realistic models of quantum matter without quasiparticle excitations.
Given a quantum many-body system, one might ask how to ascertain the absence of low-energy quasiparticles in any basis and the associated universal diagnostics, if any. The simplest diagnostic one might consider for detecting the presence of electronic quasiparticles is via poles in the single-particle Green’s function (sharp peaks in the spectral function). However, the existence of a broad electron spectral function is, by itself, not sufficient to conclude that there are no quasiparticle excitations. After all, interacting electrons in one dimension have broad electron spectral functions (Giamarchi, 2003). This is understood in Luttinger liquid theory, using a description in terms of a different set of quasiparticles: linearly dispersing bosons associated with collective excitations. The electron operator is an exponential of the boson operator, and this leads to the broad spectral functions. The bosonic quasiparticles describe all the many-body eigenstates, but the electron operator has a quite complicated form in this representation. Similarly, while the electron spectral function in certain fractional quantum Hall phases and paramagnetic Mott insulators (Broholm et al., 2020) can be complicated, at low-energies they might host emergent quasiparticle excitations that are well defined but impossible to diagnose using a two-point spectral function, as the latter quantity is not even a gauge-invariant observable. These examples illustrate that the electron spectral function is not a universal diagnostic for detecting quasiparticles; it is useful when the overlap between the wavefunction of the low-energy quasiparticle and the physical electron is nonzero (e.g., as in a Landau Fermi liquid (Abrikosov et al., 1963)). On the other hand, when the two are orthogonal, as in the examples highlighted above, the diagnostic fails and the spectral function is ill equipped to analyze the fate of quasiparticles.

A further weakness in the spectral function diagnostic is apparent when we consider disordered systems (e.g., even a disordered Fermi liquid). Electronic quasiparticles are well defined in such systems (Abrahams et al., 1981), but they are not apparent in electronic spectral functions unless the spatial form of the quasiparticle wavefunction is already known: they are not plane waves, as in Fermi liquids in clean crystals. This example makes it clear that a system with quasiparticle excitations is best characterized by an extension of the original Landau perspective (Landau, 1957): the low energy states of a many body system can be decomposed into composites of single quasiparticle states, and the energies of these states are functionals of the densities of individual quasiparticle states. In other words, quasiparticles are additive excitations of a many-body system.

In a Fermi liquid, the energy of a many-body excitation is expressed in terms of a quadratic expansion in the quasiparticle distribution, \( \{ n_\alpha \} \), with quantum numbers \( \alpha \) near the Fermi surface. The quasiparticle lifetime is set by \( 1/(\text{energy})^2 \).

With this perspective, in a many-body quantum system without quasiparticle excitations, it is not possible to decompose the low-lying states into any basis of quasiparticle excitations. This is however not a practical definition, because while it may be possible to exclude a candidate quasiparticle basis, it is very difficult to exclude them all. For a more positive and practical definition, we consider the approach of a quantum many-body system to local thermal equilibrium at a temperature \( T \) after the action of a local perturbation. In a system with quasiparticle excitations, such as a Fermi liquid, we expect that this will happen in a time that is at least as long as \( \sim 1/T^2 \) as \( T \rightarrow 0 \). This long time is required for individual quasiparticles to collide with each other. In a system without quasiparticles, we expect the time to be much shorter. But how short can the local equilibration time get as \( T \rightarrow 0 \)? Studies of numerous model systems without quasiparticle excitations, some of which are described in the present review, show that the time is never shorter than a time of order the ‘Planckian time’, \( h/(k_BT) \), i.e. the minimum time associated with an energy of order \( k_BT \) according to the Heisenberg uncertainty principle. On the other hand, it is clear from a study of systems with quasiparticles, that such systems can never equilibrate as quickly as the Planckian time, as long as quasiparticles are well-defined. So we reach the proposal that many-body quantum systems without quasiparticles are those that locally equilibrate in a time of order \( h/(k_BT) \), and no system can equilibrate any faster (Hartnoll et al., 2016; Sachdev, 1999).

Our focus in this article will primarily be on metallic quantum many-body systems without quasiparticle excitations i.e. non-Fermi liquids. Section II presents a general perspective on non-Fermi liquids, with a summary of some of their experimental signatures and an overview of some theoretical ideas and their relationship to the SYK models presented in this review. A detailed outline of the perspective of this paper appears in Section II.C. Readers wishing to focus on the SYK viewpoint can skip ahead directly to Section II.C and then to Section IV. In Sec. III, we discuss qualitatively the properties of ‘bad metals’ and ‘Planckian metals’, two forms of unconventional transport often encountered in non-Fermi liquids. In Section IV, as a warmup, we first review the random matrix model for non-interacting fermions that realizes a Fermi liquid with quasiparticles. The SYK model system is introduced and reviewed in Section V. The insights gained from this study are then applied to several extensions thereof in Sections VI, VII, VIII, X, and XI, with an eye towards capturing certain universal phenomenological aspects of quantum materials with strong electronic correlations. There are also remarkable connections between the SYK model and quantum theories of Einstein gravity in black holes, and these will be reviewed in Section XII. In recent years, precise diagnostics of a class of non-quasiparticle systems have appeared by introducing
II. TYPOLOGY OF NON-FERMI LIQUIDS

Numerous strongly correlated systems, e.g., materials with partially filled d- or f-shell orbitals and more recently in moiré systems, display a phenomenology which, while metallic, can drastically deviate from the predictions of the standard Fermi liquid (FL) theory of metals. These Non Fermi liquids (nFL) raise a series of central challenges in condensed matter physics, both experimentally and theoretically. As they are defined by what they are not, they constitute a rich and very diverse family of systems. Conceptually, they are not characterized by a few universal experimental traits, unlike Fermi liquids. In practice, they can not always be clearly identified using simple response functions, unlike other familiar phases of quantum matter with or without spontaneously broken symmetries (e.g. superconductor, antiferromagnet, quantum Hall insulator).

The family of SYK models discussed in this review constitute a solvable theoretical route to study a class of nFL behaviour, as they have some of the major characteristics of nFL metals. In particular, we will discuss their relation with Planckian metals, characterized by a linear dependence of resistivity with temperature and a characteristic scattering rate $\sim k_B T / h$. In order to set the stage for this review, we therefore start in this section by discussing a selection of the most important nFL behavior encountered experimentally (Section II A). We then introduce the main theoretical routes which have been proposed to characterise and explain them (Section II B), along with their connections to the aspects of SYK physics discussed in later sections. Finally, in Section II C, we present the general perspective of this review article and provide a detailed outline. Readers wishing to go directly to the theoretical models of this paper can skip ahead to Section II C.

A. Experimental signatures of non-Fermi liquids

We start by discussing a few experimental signatures of nFL, based on a variety of spectroscopic and transport measurements. Since d.c. transport can be difficult to interpret, it is important not to rely only on it exclusively to characterize nFL behaviour. The various signatures include:

- “Short” single particle lifetimes for excitations near the Fermi surface, as deduced e.g. from spectroscopic measurements such as angle resolved photoemission spectroscopy (ARPES) (Damascelli et al., 2003). In FL metals, the inverse quasiparticle lifetime (i.e. the scattering rate) scales as, $\Gamma_{sp} \equiv g^2 W (k_B T / E_F^*)^2$, where $g$ is a dimensionless electron-electron interaction strength, $W$ is a bare electronic energy scale (bandwidth or hopping) and $E_F^*$ is a characteristic energy scale below which coherent long-lived quasiparticle excitations emerge. $E_F^*$ can be viewed as a degeneracy scale for the Fermi gas of quasiparticles. In contrast, a strong departure from the above form that persists over a large range of energy scales is an indication of breakdown of FL behavior. In a number of experimental systems that display nFL behavior, $\Gamma_{sp}(\omega, T) \sim \max(\omega, k_B T / h)$ (Valla et al., 1999; Wang et al., 2004).

- A power-law temperature dependence of the dc resistivity deviating from the expected FL form $\sim T^2$ (due to umklapp scattering) over a broad range of temperatures, without any signs of crossovers or saturation. One of the most commonly reported behaviors is $\rho = \rho_0 + A T^\alpha$, over an extended range $T_{coh} < T < T_{uv}$ (Hartnoll and Mackenzie, 2021); see Sec. III B. However, other power-laws $\Delta \rho (\equiv \rho - \rho_0) \sim T^\alpha$, have also been observed (Allen et al., 1996; Lee et al., 2002). Identifying a material as a nFL on the basis of observation of $T$–linear resistivity above $T_{coh}$ requires special care, since electron-phonon scattering in conventional metals leads to a trivial example of the same (Ziman, 1960). However, $T$–linear resistivity presents a clear indication of behavior at odds with Boltzmann theory of FL transport in examples where $T_{coh}$ is significantly low compared to the Debye (or Bloch-Grüneisen) scale, the linearity persists without any crossovers across multiple phonon energy scales, and there are no obvious collective-modes to which a similar phonon-type argument can be applied directly. We return to a discussion of the physical significance of $T_{coh}$, in subsequent sections. It is also worth noting that in some materials, such as optimally doped cuprates (Giraldo-Gallo et al., 2018), certain heavy-fermion materials (Stewart, 2001) and twisted bilayer graphene (Jaoui et al., 2021), this behavior persists down to a low $T_{coh} \rightarrow 0$.

- Bad metallic behavior (Emery and Kivelson, 1995; Gunnarsson et al., 2003; Hussey et al., 2004) with a resistivity that is an increasing function of temperature with $\rho \gtrsim \rho_Q (\rho_Q = h/e^2 a^{d-2})$, where $a$ is a microscopic length scale and $h/e^2 \simeq 25.8k\Omega$ the quantum of resistance) is also indicative of nFL behavior. A majority of the systems of interest to us are quasi two-dimensional (with appreciable transport anisotropy in the $ab$–plane vs. along the $c$–axis) and it is thus useful to quote the results for the sheet-resistivities in units of $h/e^2$. While bad-metals can arise at very high temper-
At low-temperature regime without any characteristic crossovers that defies Fermi liquid behavior. In the literature, the expressions bad, or, strange are often used to refer to certain nFL metals. In this review, we reserve the term bad metals to designate systems in which the resistivity is larger than the Mott-Ioffe-Regel value and strange metals to materials with a resistivity smaller than this value but displaying a set of behavior incompatible with the quasiparticle-based framework of Fermi liquid theory. We discuss bad metallic transport in the high-temperature regime in more detail in Sec. III.A below.

- An anomalous power-law dependence of the optical conductivity, \( \sigma(\omega) \sim 1/\omega^x \), over an extended range of frequencies, differing from conventional Drude behavior. This is observed in cuprates (Baraduc et al., 1996; El Azrak et al., 1994; Hwang et al., 2007; van der Marel et al., 2003; Schlesinger et al., 2019) and has also been reported in other materials (Dodge et al., 2000; Kostic et al., 1998; Limelette et al., 2013; Mena et al., 2003; Phanindra et al., 2018; Schwartz et al., 1998). This is also often accompanied by \( (\omega/T) - \) scaling as a function of temperature, i.e. \( \sigma(\omega,T) \sim 1/\omega^x F(\omega/T) \) (Lee et al., 2002b; Limelette et al., 2013; van der Marel et al., 2003; van der Marel et al., 2006). At higher energy or temperature, a transfer of spectral weight over energy scales larger (sometimes much larger) than \( k_B T \) are also typically observed as temperature is varied (Basov et al., 2011; Georges et al., 1996; Rozenberg et al., 1996). A simultaneous analysis of both dc transport and optical conductivity (or other frequency-dependent response functions) is often crucial in reaching an understanding of the nFL phenomenology in a specific material.

- An unconventional charge-density response, exemplified by a featureless continuum extending over a broad range of energy scales, as measured in Raman scattering experiments (Bozovic et al., 1987; Slakey et al., 1991). Recent measurements using momentum-resolved electron energy loss spectroscopy have further revealed a featureless two-particle continuum and an overdamped plasmon excitation (Husain et al., 2020; Husain et al., 2019; Mitran et al., 2018), that is strikingly at odds with the expectations in a Fermi liquid metal.

### B. Theoretical models of non-Fermi liquids

Classifying insulating gapped phases of matter in terms of their symmetry and topological properties, using the lens of many-body entanglement, has been a remarkably successful venture (Wen, 2017). On the other hand, classifying gapless phases of matter, and non-Fermi liquids in particular, remains an outstanding challenge. We shall not attempt to embark on such an endeavor here. This review will focus on a few distinct classes of nFL without quasiparticles, that can be described using various generalizations of the solvable SYK model. We find it useful nevertheless to first provide a broader overview of some of the theoretical frameworks and routes that lead to examples of non-Fermi liquids in clean crystalline systems without disorder.

- A class of models involves the quantum-critical fluctuations of a bosonic degree of freedom coupled...
to an electronic Fermi surface (Löhneysen et al., 2007). These fluctuations are associated with the order-parameter corresponding to the spontaneous breaking of a point-group (‘nematic’), translational (spin/charge density-wave) or spin-rotation (ferromagnetism) symmetry. In the absence of any other instability, e.g. to pairing, the resulting ground state is a nFL that controls the properties of the system in a range of temperatures above the critical point. The nature of the low-energy excitations near the Fermi surface are clearly different depending on whether the order parameter carries zero, or a finite center-of-mass momentum, $\mathbf{Q}$. This framework of an electronic Fermi surface coupled to the low-energy fluctuations of a Landau order-parameter often goes under the name of Hertz-Millis-Moriya criticality (Millis, 1993; Moriya, 1985; Sachdev, 1999). A critical boson with $\mathbf{Q} = 0$ (e.g. nematic order) can destroy electronic quasiparticles around the entire Fermi surface (Fig. 1a). At the critical point, the resulting state realizes a classic example of a critical Fermi surface (Metlitski and Sachdev, 2010; Mross et al., 2010) and provides an ideal setting for studying the interplay of nFL physics and superconductivity (Berg et al., 2019; Metlitski et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2016). The low-energy field theory for such metallic criticality in $(2 + 1)$--dimensions presents a significant theoretical challenge (Lee, 2009). The insights provided by the solvable SYK model into such systems are reviewed in Section XI. A critical boson with $\mathbf{Q} \neq 0$ (e.g. density-wave order) destroys electronic quasiparticles near only certain special points on the Fermi surface (‘hot-spots’) as it gets reconstructed into pockets, while much of the Fermi surface continues to host long-lived quasiparticles. See (Berg et al., 2019; Lee, 2017) for some recent complementary theoretical progress into both classes of such order-parameter based metallic criticality.

- A different form of quantum criticality leading to nFL behavior is associated with the disappearance of entire electronic Fermi surfaces (Coleman et al., 2001). Prominent examples of such criticality include continuous metal-insulator transitions between a FL metal and a paramagnetic Mott insulator at fixed density (Fig. 1b) (Florens and Georges, 2004; Senthil, 2008a,b); see also (Kotliar, 1995), and a Kondo breakdown transition in a heavy Fermi liquid to a fractionalized FL (Fig. 1c) (Burdin et al., 2002; Coleman et al., 2001; Paul et al., 2007, 2008, 2013; Schroder et al., 2000; Senthil et al., 2003, 2004; Si et al., 2001, 2003). The critical point across both of these transitions also hosts an electronic critical Fermi surface without low-energy Landau quasiparticles (Senthil, 2008a; Senthil et al., 2004). All currently known low-energy theories for describing such continuous transitions involve fractionalized degrees of freedom coupled to emergent dynamical gauge fields. Most theoretical descriptions of these continuous transitions have a remnant Fermi surface of the fractionalized degrees of freedom (and not of electrons) coupled to dynamical gauge fields on one side of the critical point; we will continue to refer to these as critical Fermi surfaces in this article. Continuous metal-insulator transitions without any remnant Fermi surface of even fractionalized degrees of freedom provide examples of a new form of ‘deconfined’ metallic quantum criticality; see (Zhang and Sachdev, 2020; Zou and Chowdhury, 2020) for some recent progress in describing such transitions. In particular, all of these transitions fall beyond the order-parameter based Hertz-Millis-Moriya framework described above. The insights of SY model with random exchange interactions in the presence of a uniform Kondo exchange for two-orbital models will be applied to study a special case of such abrupt Fermi-volume changing transitions in Section VIII.

- In contrast to the examples above that arise at certain $T = 0$ quantum critical points, a nFL can arise as a stable phase at zero temperature. One of the most well-known examples of such nFL behavior is found in a two-dimensional electron gas at high magnetic fields at a filling factor, $\nu = 1/2$. The metallic nFL state is compressible and otherwise known as the composite Fermi liquid (CFL); it hosts a sharp Fermi surface but the low-energy excitations are not electrons, but composite fermions (CF) (Jain, 2007). The low-energy theory for the CFL is described in terms of a CF Fermi-sea coupled to a dynamical gauge-field (Halperin et al., 1993; Son, 2015). Other examples of nFL phases at $T = 0$ have also been observed in numerical studies of lattice models (Jiang et al., 2012).

We note that there are insulating (and incompressible) phases of matter that are expected to arise in a class of paramagnetic Mott insulators, where fractionalized degrees of freedom (e.g. spinons) form a Fermi surface and are coupled minimally to an emergent gauge-field (Altshuler et al., 1994; Lee, 1989). The low-energy field theory for such phases shares similarities with the theory for the CFL, but there are important conceptual differences. A theoretical description of the low-energy field theory for the Fermi surface of spinons coupled to a dynamical gauge field suffers from the same problem that was noted earlier (Lee, 2009); the solvable SYK model of Section XI offers a controlled complementary un-
derstanding of this problem.

- For sufficiently strong interactions and over a range of intermediate temperatures, it is possible that nFL behavior emerges generically and is not controlled by the proximity to a quantum critical point (or phase). Moreover, the nFL regime appears only as a crossover regime at intermediate temperatures while the ground state is a conventional phase (such as a FL, superconductor etc.). These nFL regimes can be described as “infra-red (IR) incomplete”, unlike the examples described earlier which are, in principle, controlled by \( T = 0 \) fixed-points. Some prominent and well understood examples of such IR incomplete behavior include the classic electron-phonon system above the Debye temperature (Ziman, 1960), spin-incoherent Luttinger liquids (Fiete, 2007), generic lattice models with a finite bandwidth at high temperatures (Mukerjee et al., 2006) (see also (Lindner and Auerbach, 2010)), and certain holographic non-Fermi liquids (Faulkner et al., 2011b; Liu et al., 2011). Interestingly, a number of theoretical examples of such IR-incomplete behavior are accompanied by an extensive residual entropy, obtained from an extrapolation to the limit of \( T \to 0 \); the excess entropy is then relieved below the crossover to the conventional phase. Our treatment of such systems will appear in the discussion on lattice models of one and two-band models of SYK atoms in Section X.

C. Perspective of this review

An important idea in our approach is that it is possible to make progress on many intractable problems in the theory of non-Fermi liquids by considering models with random interactions. At first sight, this appears counter-intuitive, because spatial randomness introduces new phenomena associated with localization which are not of interest to us here. However, most of the models considered below live on fully connected lattices on which disorder-induced localization cannot take place. Indeed, the local electronic properties are strongly self-averaging, and the observable properties of a single sample with disorder are indistinguishable from the average of an ensemble of samples in the infinite-volume limit. Furthermore, one can argue that the strong incoherence associated with the absence of quasiparticles also removes localization effects which require quantum coherence and interference processes (Lee and Ramakrishnan, 1985). A non-Fermi liquid system without disorder thermalizes in the shortest possible time, and this implies chaotic behavior in which the memory of the initial conditions is rapidly lost. Consequently, it is possible to view averaging over disorder as a technical tool which allows access to the collective properties of a system with strong many-body quantum chaos.

We can also restrict the disorder exclusively to a flavor space, and so study non-Fermi liquids with full translational symmetry, as we shall do in Sections X and XI. Here, the idea is that, after some renormalization group flow, a large set of theories flow to the same universal low energy behavior. And we find that it is easier to access the universal theory by averaging over a suitable set of microscopic couplings.

Indeed, the idea of using an average over random systems to understand quantum chaos has long been present in the theory of single-particle quantum chaos. We will discuss this in Section IV, where we will review the random matrix theory of non-interacting fermions: this has been a successful model of the quantum theory of particles whose classical dynamics is chaotic.

Section V introduces the SYK model of fermions with random two-body interactions with \( N \) single particle states. We will present the exact solution of the many-body system without quasiparticle excitations obtained in the \( N \to \infty \) limit. Much is also understood about the finite \( N \) fluctuations, including some results with a remarkable accuracy of \( \exp(-N) \). This fluctuation theory relies on a mapping to a low energy effective theory of time reparameterization fluctuations, which is also the theory of a ‘boundary graviton’ in the quantum theory of certain black holes of Einstein-Maxwell theory of gravity and electromagnetism.

Section VI turns to a quantum generalization of the thoroughly studied Sherrington-Kirkpatrick model of a classical spin glass with Ising spins \( \sigma_i = \pm 1 \) \((i = 1 \ldots N \to \infty)\) with random and all-to-all interactions \( J_{ij} \) with zero mean. The quantum model replaces \( \sigma_i \) with quantum \( S = 1/2 \) SU(2) spins \( S_i \) which have random Heisenberg interactions \( J_{ij} \). We will review a variety of studies of this model, involving numerical exact diagonalization, renormalization group, and large \( M \) expansions of models with SU(M) spin symmetry. These results show that the \( S = 1/2 \) SU(2) model has spin glass order similar to that of the classical Sherrington-Kirkpatrick model. However, the spin glass order parameter is quite small, and for a wide range of intermediate frequencies, the dynamical spectrum of the SU(2) model matches that of the SYK model (obtained here in the large \( M \) limit).

Sections VII and VIII discuss the familiar and intensively studied single-band Hubbard and two-band Kondo-Heisenberg models, respectively, of strong electronic correlations. We will consider models with an additional random exchange interaction \( J_{ij} \), which can be used to justify an extended dynamic mean field theory with self-consistency conditions on both the single electron and spin correlators. Such theories apply also to models with non-random single-particle dispersion, but it is useful to focus on a simplified limit with random and all-to-all single electron hopping \( t_{ij} \). We will use methods
similar to those in Section VI to show that these models exhibit quantum phase transitions between two metals: a metallic spin glass and a Fermi liquid. In the quantum critical region, we find a non-Fermi liquid with SYK-like correlations. Section IX will present an overview of recent advances in the numerical methods employed for the analyses in Sections VII and VIII.

Section X presents a different approach towards generalizing SYK models to lattice systems. We consider a lattice of ‘SYK-atoms’, where each lattice site has \( N \) orbitals, and the intra-atomic electronic interactions are assumed to have the random SYK form. We will consider the case where all SYK atoms are identical (so that there is lattice translational symmetry) vs. the case where the interactions are different random instances on each site, and comment on their similarities and differences. These models can be used to realize non-Fermi liquids with a SYK character and no singular spatial correlations, but with a bad metallic resistivity. Generalizations of these models to include additional orbitals, in the spirit of two-band models of heavy-fermion materials, lead to strange metals with \( T \)-linear resistivity, critical Fermi surfaces and a marginal Fermi liquid behavior (Varma et al., 1989).

Section XI returns to models of Fermi surfaces coupled to critical bosons, which we introduced earlier in Section II.B. We describe how a systematic large \( N \) theory of a class of non-Fermi liquids can be obtained by applying SYK-like approaches to these well-studied models. We generalize the models to \( \sim N \) flavors of fermions and bosons, with a random Yukawa coupling between the fermions and bosons. The randomness can be independent of space, so that the models have translational symmetry.

Section XII explores the remarkable connections between the SYK model and the quantum theory of black holes. We will highlight some recent developments, particularly those we think are of interest to condensed matter physicists.

We end with a brief outlook on open questions in Section XIII.

### III. BAD METALS AND PLANCKIAN METALS

As emphasized above, a prime signature of nFL behaviour is unconventional transport. In this section, we provide a qualitative discussion contrasting high-temperature ‘bad metallic’ behaviour to ‘Planckian transport’ persisting down to low-\( T \). This review focuses mostly on solvable models aiming at providing insight into the latter.

#### A. Bad Metals: Mott-Ioffe-Regel criterion and a high-temperature perspective

In considering transport in semiconductors, Ioffe and Regel (Ioffe and Regel, 1960) and Mott (Mott, 1974) argued that metallic transport in the conventional sense requires that the mean-free path, \( \ell \), of quasiparticles should be longer than the typical lattice spacing, \( a \). For a quasi two-dimensional conductor with a single parabolic band and a simple cylindrical Fermi surface of radius \( k_F \), the Drude expression for conductivity \( \sigma = ne^2\tau/m \) can be rewritten as:

\[
\sigma = \frac{e^2}{h} \frac{1}{\tau} k_F \ell, \tag{3.1}
\]

in which \( c \) is the interlayer distance. Hence, when the sheet conductance becomes smaller than the conductance quantum \( e^2/h \), the Mott-Ioffe-Regel (MIR) criterion is violated and this suggests that a Drude-Boltzmann description of transport is no longer valid. The criterion itself is not a quantitatively precise one, depending on whether \( \ell \) is compared to \( a \), or to the Fermi wavelength \( \lambda_F = 2\pi/k_F \).

‘Good’ metals typically have resistivities that are much smaller than \( \rho_Q \) and correspondingly \( \ell \gg a \). In the context of unconventional metallic transport, the physical significance of the MIR criterion has been a confusing issue for quite a while, as reviewed e.g. in (Gunnarsson et al., 2003; Hussey et al., 2004). Some materials, such as the A15 compounds (Fisk and Webb, 1976), display a resistivity saturation as the MIR value is approached, leading to the speculation that resistivity saturation should perhaps be a general fact. It is worth noting that there is no fundamental theoretical understanding for resistivity saturation in metals. ¹ Moreover, a wealth of experimental data collected on materials with strong electronic correlations, most notably transition-metal oxides, came in to contradict the very notion of resistivity saturation. Indeed, resistivity in many such materials can increase significantly above the MIR value without any trend towards saturation or even any characteristic feature signalling this crossover in the temperature dependence of \( \rho \). The term ‘bad’ metal was coined to highlight this behavior (Emery and Kivelson, 1995). A material displaying bad metallic behavior at a high temperature can become a good Fermi liquid at a low temperature with long-lived coherent quasiparticles, an outstanding example being Sr₂RuO₄ (Tyler et al., 1998). Low-carrier density materials such as doped SrTiO₃ also have bad metallic behavior at high-\( T \) (Collignon et al., 2020) while displaying quantum oscillations and coherent transport at low-\( T \) (Collignon et al., 2019).

¹ Recent work has analyzed resistivity saturation, and lack thereof, in solvable models of electrons coupled to a large number of phonon modes (Werman and Berg, 2016; Werman et al., 2017).
Recent studies (Deng et al., 2013, 2014) have considerably clarified the physical significance of the MIR criterion. It is now understood that the temperature $T_{\text{MIR}}$ at which the resistivity becomes of the order of the MIR value corresponds to the complete disappearance of quasiparticles. Typically, in systems which become FL at low-$T$, the scale $T_F$ below which long-lived coherent (Landau) quasiparticles with $\Gamma_{\text{sp}} \sim T^2$ are observed is significantly smaller than $T_{\text{MIR}}$. In Sr$_2$RuO$_4$ for example, $T_F \approx 30$ K, while $T_{\text{MIR}}$ is several hundreds of kelvin. Studies of the doped Hubbard model in the dynamical mean-field theory (DMFT) framework have documented this interpretation in a precise manner. There, $T_{\text{MIR}}$ was found to be of the order of the Brinkman-Rice scale $\sim p.t$ (with $p$ the doping level and $t$ the typical hopping or bare Fermi energy), while a much lower scale is associated with $T_F$ — for a renormalization group interpretation of that scale, see (Heid et al., 2013). It was shown that ‘resilient quasiparticles’ exist in the intermediate regime $T_F < T < T_{\text{MIR}}$: the spectral function displays a broadened but well-defined peak and transport can still be described in terms of these excitations, reminiscent of the notions introduced (Prange and Kadanoff, 1964) for electron-phonon scattering. It was also shown (Deng et al., 2014) that the quasiparticle lifetime follows a $1/T^2$ law up to a higher temperature than the transport lifetime itself, and hence than the temperature at which the resistivity deviates from $T^2$.

Considerable insight in interpreting transport results can be gained by simultaneously considering spectroscopy experiments, most notably optical conductivity, and the corresponding transfers of spectral weight upon changing temperature. In studies of the doped Hubbard model (Deng et al., 2013), it was shown that these transfers are limited to the low-energy region between the Drude peak and the mid-infrared range for $T_F < T < T_{\text{MIR}}$, while the MIR crossover is signalled by spectral weight transfers over a much larger energy range, leading to a broad featureless optical conductivity for $T > T_{\text{MIR}}$.

At temperatures exceeding the (finite) bandwidth for lattice fermions, it is natural to find bad metallic transport with a resistivity scaling linearly with temperature. We briefly review here the physical nature of this high-$T$ regime which is by now well understood. One approach to this regime is to start from the Kubo formula for the optical conductivity:

$$\sigma(\omega, T) = \frac{\pi}{k_B T} \frac{1}{Z} \sum_{n,m} |J_{nm}|^2 \delta(E_n - E_m - \hbar\omega),$$

(3.2)

where $n, m$ label the eigenstates of the generic many-body Hamiltonian with energies $E_n, E_m$, respectively. The matrix elements of the total current operator between the two states are denoted $J_{nm}$ and $Z = \sum_n e^{-\beta E_n}$ is the partition function. When $T$ is the largest energy scale in the problem, this expression reduces to

$$\sigma(\omega, T) \approx \frac{\pi}{k_B T} \frac{1}{Z} \sum_{n,m} J_{nm}^2 \delta(E_n - E_m - \hbar\omega).$$

(3.3)

For generic lattice models, and more generally any system for which the sum is finite in the thermodynamic limit, Eq. (3.3) implies that $T$-linear resistivity is expected in the high-$T$ regime; importantly for generic non-integrable models the matrix-elements $J_{nm}$ are expected to have a ‘random-matrix’ form even in the absence of any randomness (Mukerjee et al., 2006). This analysis has recently been extended to study several interacting models over a wider range of temperatures (Patel and Changlani, 2021). The expression for the conductivity in Eq. (3.2) looks deceptively simple but usually presents a significant computational challenge when evaluated for the entire many-body spectrum.

The origin of $T$-linear resistivity (and deviations thereof at lower $T$) can also be approached from a systematic high-$T$ expansion of the optical conductivity (Linder and Anberach, 2010; Perepelitsky et al., 2016). Computational investigations of transport in two-dimensional Hubbard models in the high-$T$ regime have appeared recently, using quantum Monte Carlo (Huang et al., 2019) and the finite-temperature Lanczos method (Vranic et al., 2020; Vucicevic et al., 2019).

Complementary and model-independent insights into this high-$T$ regime can be obtained by considering the Einstein-Sutherland relation relating the dc conductivity $\sigma_{dc}$, charge diffusion coefficient $D_c$, and charge compressibility $\chi_c$ (Gunnarsson et al., 2003); see also (Hartnoll, 2014; Perepelitsky et al., 2016).

When thermoelectric effects can be neglected, this relation reads:

$$\sigma_{dc} = \chi_c D_c, \quad \chi_c = \frac{\partial n}{\partial \mu}$$

(3.4)

with $n$ the average density and $\mu$ the chemical potential. In the high-temperature limit, where the gas of Fermi particles is non-degenerate, the origin of $\sigma_c \sim 1/T$ is tied simply to the thermodynamic property $\chi_c \sim 1/T$ rather than to the $T$-dependence of $D_c$ (or equivalently, of the scattering rate). Hence, in that regime, bad metallic transport does correspond to a saturation phenomenon, although not of the resistivity itself but rather of the diffusion constant or scattering rate. Indeed, in a lattice model, it is natural that the minimum possible value of the diffusion constant should be of order $D_c \sim a^2/\tau_0$ with $a$ the lattice spacing and the microscopic time-scale $\tau_0 \sim \hbar/t$ with $t$ the bare hopping.

In the solid-state context, probing experimentally the regime where $T$ is comparable to the hopping amplitude is challenging, except possibly in flat-band materials, but is usually complicated by the intervening role of phonons and other remote dispersive bands. From
that perspective, cold atomic gases in optical lattices offer an ideal platform for studying transport in ‘hot’ or intermediate temperature regimes, as documented by recent experimental investigations (Anderson et al., 2019; Brown et al., 2019; Xu et al., 2019). Fig. 2(a)-(b) displays the measured diffusion constant and compressibility, and the ‘resistivity’ calculated using the Einstein-Sutherland relation for two-component fermions in an optical lattice realizing a two-dimensional Hubbard model, measured as a function of temperature in the range $T/t = 0.3 - 8$ (Brown et al., 2019). It is seen that the regime dominated by thermodynamics $\chi_c \sim 1/T$, $D_c \sim \text{const.}$ is indeed observed at the highest temperatures, crossing over into a regime at lower $T$ in which both the diffusion constant and compressibility exhibit $T$-dependent crossovers. Correspondingly, the resistivity as given by Eq. (3.4) becomes smaller than the MIR value at the lowest temperature while exhibiting a $T$-linear behavior without any noticeable feature or change of slope across the crossover.

The high-$T$ mechanism for $T$-linear bad-metallic transport should be contrasted with the ‘Planckian regime’ (Zaanen, 2004), discussed in more details below, in which the diffusion constant (or, scattering time) is temperature dependent, $D_c \sim a^2 \hbar k_B T$, while the compressibility is temperature independent (Hartnoll, 2014). In most of the low-temperature nFL systems with a resistivity smaller than the MIR value. We reserve the term ‘strange’ metal to systems and regimes with a resistivity larger than the MIR value. relaxing a two-dimensional Hubbard model, measured as a function of temperature in the range $T/t = 0.3 - 8$ (Brown et al., 2019). It is seen that the regime dominated by thermodynamics $\chi_c \sim 1/T$, $D_c \sim \text{const.}$ is indeed observed at the highest temperatures, crossing over into a regime at lower $T$ in which both the diffusion constant and compressibility exhibit $T$-dependent crossovers. Correspondingly, the resistivity as given by Eq. (3.4) becomes smaller than the MIR value at the lowest temperature while exhibiting a $T$-linear behavior without any noticeable feature or change of slope across the crossover.

The high-$T$ mechanism for $T$-linear bad-metallic transport should be contrasted with the ‘Planckian regime’ (Zaanen, 2004), discussed in more details below, in which the diffusion constant (or, scattering time) is temperature dependent, $D_c \sim a^2 \hbar k_B T$, while the compressibility is temperature independent (Hartnoll, 2014). In most of the low-temperature nFL exhibiting $T$-linear bad-metallic transport should be contrasted with the ‘Planckian regime’ (Zaanen, 2004), discussed in more details below, in which the diffusion constant (or, scattering time) is temperature dependent, $D_c \sim a^2 \hbar k_B T$, while the compressibility is temperature independent (Hartnoll, 2014). In most of the low-temperature nFL exhibiting $T$-linear resistivity is observed. The above analysis becomes especially difficult in multi-orbital systems and the effective masses are often extracted from quantum oscillations, or, specific heat; it is far from being clear why this is a relevant quantity that should determine the momentum relaxation rate even within Drude theory.

Nevertheless, it is quite remarkable that for a number of metals exhibiting a broad regime of $T$-linear resistivity including the cuprates, pnictides, ruthenates, organics and rare-earth element materials, the above “operational” definition of a scattering rate leads to $\alpha \approx 1$ (Bruin et al., 2013). A similar analysis in magic-angle twisted bilayer graphene near half-filling of the electron and hole-like flat-bands (Cao et al., 2020; Jaoui et al., 2021; Polshyn et al., 2019) corresponds to $D_c \sim 1/T$ (Park et al., 2021). It should be noted that Planckian behavior and bad metallic behavior are not mutually exclusive: indeed we shall discuss in Sections VII.D.1 and X models in which $D_c \sim 1/T$ while the resistivity is larger than the MIR value.

In the remainder of this review, we continue to refer to ‘bad’ metals as systems with a resistivity larger than the MIR value. We reserve the term ‘strange’ metal to systems or regimes with a resistivity smaller than the MIR value but having an unconventional power-law behavior at odds with expectations in a Fermi liquid. This article devotes special interest to the latter, only occasionally discussing bad metals when relevant.

B. Planckian relaxation: unity in diversity?

Carrier numbers and effective masses may be very different from one material to another, and thus it is often not a meaningful exercise to compare the actual values of the resistivity across different materials. Instead, comparing the relaxation timescales associated with transport can shed interesting light on the universal mechanisms that govern nFL properties. Unfortunately, obtaining a transport lifetime from measurements of a dc resistivity is not a straightforward exercise.

We focus here on instances in which a resistivity depending linearly on temperature $\rho = \rho_0 + A T$ is observed — see Fig. 3 for some examples and (Hartnoll and Mackenzie, 2021; Hussey, 2008; Proust and Taillefer, 2019; Varma, 2020) for reviews. A particular procedure that has been adopted to extract a temperature dependent transport scattering rate, $\Gamma_{dc}$ in such materials (Bruin et al., 2013) relies on a “Drude” fit, where one expresses $\rho = m^* T_{dc}/n_c e^2$. Assuming that the effective mass, $m^*$, and carrier concentration, $n_c$, are temperature independent, one writes

$$\Gamma_{dc} \equiv \alpha \frac{k_B T}{\hbar}, \quad \alpha = \frac{\hbar}{k_B} \frac{e^2 n_c}{m^* A}. \quad (3.5)$$

In the experimental analysis, $m^*$ and $n_c$ are typically extracted from low-temperature measurements (i.e. $n_c \equiv n_c(T \to 0)$, $m^* \equiv m^*(T \to 0)$), which does not always coincide with the regime in which the clearest signature of an extended $T$-linear resistivity is observed. The above analysis becomes especially difficult in multi-orbital systems and the effective masses are often extracted from quantum oscillations, or, specific heat; it is far from being clear why this is a relevant quantity that should determine the momentum relaxation rate even within Drude theory.

Nevertheless, it is quite remarkable that for a number of metals exhibiting a broad regime of $T$-linear resistivity including the cuprates, pnictides, ruthenates, organics and rare-earth element materials, the above “operational” definition of a scattering rate leads to $\alpha \approx 1$ (Bruin et al., 2013). A similar analysis in magic-angle twisted bilayer graphene near half-filling of the electron and hole-like flat-bands (Cao et al., 2020; Jaoui et al., 2021), in twisted transition metal dichalcogenides (Ghiotto et al., 2021), several cuprates over an extended range of doping levels (Legros et al., 2019) and a non-superconducting iron-pnictide (Nakajima et al., 2020) have also found indication of a Planckian scattering rate with $\alpha \approx 1$. Recent measurements of angle-dependent magnetoresistance (ADMR) near the pseudogap critical point in Nd-LSCO also reveal a Fermi surface with an isotropic Planckian scattering set by $\alpha \approx 1$ (Grissonnanche et al., 2021). Note that this conclusion holds in the latter case provided a $T$-independent effective mass

\footnote{The dc transport need not have a Drude-like form in generic nFL metals.}
FIG. 2 Measurement of the diffusion constant (a) and compressibility ((a)-inset) for a gas of ultra-cold $^6$Li atoms in an optical lattice, realizing a two-dimensional Fermi-Hubbard model with $U/t \simeq 7.5$ at a density $n \simeq 0.825$. (b) Reconstructed ‘resistivity’ using Einstein-Sutherland relation. Grey horizontal dashed line represents the estimated MIR value. Theoretical calculations using DMFT (in green) and the finite-$T$ Lanczos method (in blue) are shown; the band representation indicates estimated error bars. Adapted from (Brown et al., 2019).

FIG. 3 Examples of $T$–linear resistivity extending over a wide range of temperature scales in (a) hole-doped La$_{2-x}$Sr$_x$CuO$_4$ (LSCO) near optimal doping (adapted from (Giraldo-Gallo et al., 2018)), and (b) magic-angle twisted bilayer graphene (MATBG) near $\nu \approx -2$, relative to charge neutrality, $\nu = 0$ (adapted from (Jaoui et al., 2021)). In LSCO, $T_{\text{coh}}$ can be inferred to be much lower than any characteristic energy scales by turning on a magnetic field and accounting for the finite magnetoresistance ((a)-top inset); the variation of the slope ($\Lambda$) on hole-doping is shown in (a)-bottom inset. In MATBG, the linearity for a range of dopings near $\nu \approx -2$ ((b)-inset) persists down to $\sim 40$ mK. Both family of materials also display a Planckian form of $\Gamma_{dc}$ (Eq. 3.5).

associated with intermediate energy scales (and consistent with ARPES and ADMR) is used, rather than the
thermodynamic effective mass associated with specific heat which displays a logarithmic $T$-dependence.

It is important to note that a $T$–linear resistivity with a Planckian scattering rate (Eqn. 3.5) is observed in conventional metals like copper, gold etc. This is not a surprise and as noted earlier, the behavior is associated with electron-phonon scattering where the phonons are in a classical equi-partition regime. There have been discussions (Sadovskii, 2020, 2021) of a possible rationale for $\alpha \approx 1$ in regimes where electron-phonon and electron-electron interactions contribute to $T$-linearity on a similar footing. However, Planckian scattering that persists down to extremely low temperatures (Cao et al., 2020; Giraldo-Gallo et al., 2018; Jaoui et al., 2021) in nFL that are not low-density materials, and where the behavior persists across multiple phonon frequencies without any crossovers presents a challenge to theory. A more in-depth discussion of Planckian timescales across solid-state materials has appeared in a recent review (Hartnoll and Mackenzie, 2021).

We end this section by noting that there does not exist a universal definition of a “transport scattering rate”, making it difficult to formulate a precise theoretical Planckian bound. Even experimentally, as seen above, the procedure used most often to extract a scattering rate relies on a number of approximations. In that sense, the use of Einstein-Sutherland relation to extract a diffusion constant, combined with the recent progress in measuring electronic compressibility discussed above, may be a safer route to follow whenever possible.

Optical spectroscopy measurements of the complex conductivity are often parameterized in terms of a frequency and temperature-dependent optical time scale and effective mass enhancements as (Basov et al., 2011):

$$4\pi\sigma(\omega)/\omega_p^2 = [1/\tau_{\text{opt}}(\omega) - i\omega m^*_{\text{opt}}(\omega)/m]^{-1},$$

which can be directly determined from experimental data as $1/\tau_{\text{opt}} = \omega_p^2/4\pi\text{Re}[1/\sigma]$ (Basov et al., 2011) once a normalisation of the spectral weight $\omega_p^2/4\pi$ has been chosen.

In a subset of the nFL metals highlighted above, including optimally doped cuprates (van der Marel et al., 2003), the low-frequency limit of $1/\tau_{\text{opt}}$ was also shown to have a Planckian form and $\omega/T$ scaling was observed.

In later sections of this review, we will discuss a number of recent studies that have demonstrated the existence of a Planckian timescale for transport in solvable models of correlated electrons.

IV. RANDOM MATRIX MODEL: FREE FERMIONS

In the study of charge transport in mesoscopic structures, much experimental effort has focused on electrons moving through ‘quantum dots’ (Alhassid, 2000). We can idealize a quantum dot as a ‘billiard’, a cavity with irregular walls. The electrons scatter off the walls, before eventually escaping through the leads. If we treat the electron motion classically, we can follow a chaotic trajectory of particles bouncing off the walls of the billiard.

Much mathematical effort has been devoted to the semi-classical quantization of such non-interacting particles: the ‘quantum billiard’ problem. The Bohigas-Giannoni-Schmit conjecture (Bohigas et al., 1984) states that many statistical properties of this quantum billiard can be described by a model in which the electrons hop on a random matrix; there has been recent progress (Müller et al., 2009) towards establishing this conjecture. It is this random matrix problem that we will describe in this section.

Many properties of the random-matrix model are similar to a model of a disordered metal in which the electrons occupy plane wave eigenstates which scatter off randomly placed impurities with a short-range potential. However, unlike the random impurity case, there is no regime in which the eigenstates of a random matrix can be localized. As every site is coupled to every other site, there is no sense of space or distance along which the eigenstate can decay exponentially. The absence of localization also extends to non-fully-connected lattices with infinite connectivity, such as a regular hypercubic lattice in $d$-dimensions in the $d \to \infty$ limit. Indeed, it can be shown that in this limit the local density of states self-averages (see below), which implies the absence of Anderson localisation (Dobrosavljević and Kotliar, 1997).

A. Green’s function

We consider electrons $c_i$ (assumed spinless, for simplicity) hopping between sites labeled $i = 1, \ldots, N$, with a hopping matrix element $t_{ij}/\sqrt{N}$:

$$H_2 = \frac{1}{(N)^{1/2}} \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} t_{ij} c_i^\dagger c_j - \mu \sum_i c_i^\dagger c_i$$

$$c_i^\dagger c_j + c_j^\dagger c_i = 0 \quad c_i^\dagger c_j^\dagger + c_j^\dagger c_i^\dagger = \delta_{ij}$$

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_i c_i^\dagger c_i = Q.$$ 

The $t_{ij}$ are chosen to be independent random complex numbers with $t_{ij} = t_{ji}^*$, $t_{ij} = 0$ and $|t_{ij}|^2 = t^2$. The $1/\sqrt{N}$ scaling of the hopping has been chosen so that the bandwidth of the single electron eigenstates will be of order unity in the $N \to \infty$ limit, and therefore (as there are $N$ eigenstates) the spacing between the successive eigenvalues will be of order $1/N$. We have also included a chemical potential so that the average density of electrons on each site is $Q$. The subscript ‘($2$)’ in the Hamiltonian, $H_2$, denotes that it only includes two electron operators.

For a given set of $t_{ij}$, one can numerically diagonalize the $N \times N$ matrix $t_{ij}$ to solve this problem. We denote by $\{ |\lambda\rangle, \lambda \}$ the spectrum of eigenstates of the matrix.
$t_{ij}$ for a given realisation. However, in the limit of large $N$, it turns out that certain quantities self-average. In other words, certain observables take the same value on every site, and that value is realized for a given sample with probability 1 in the $N \to \infty$ limit. We will only be interested in such observables here.

We define as usual the single-particle Green’s function as:

$$G_{ij}(\tau) = -\left\langle T_{\tau} c_i(\tau) c_j^\dagger(0) \right\rangle,$$  
with $\tau$ the imaginary time and $G_{ij}(\tau + \beta) = -G_{ij}(\tau)$. For a given sample, we can expand this function in terms of the one-particle eigenstates as:

$$G_{ij}(z) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\lambda} \langle i | \lambda \rangle \frac{1}{z + \mu - \epsilon_{\lambda}} \langle \lambda | j \rangle,$$  
where $z$ denotes a complex frequency, for example the Matsubara frequencies $\omega_n = (2n+1)\pi/\beta$. In the limit of large $N$, and the sites $i,j$ being fixed, the Green’s function self-averages:

$$G_{ij}(\tau) \to G(\tau) \delta_{ij}.$$  

The simplest way to establish this result consists in evaluating averages of $G_{ij}$ order-by-order in a perturbation theory in $t_{ij}$. At zeroth-order, the Green’s function is simply

$$G_{ij}^0(\omega_n) = \frac{\delta_{ij}}{\omega_n + \mu}.$$  

The Feynman graph expansion consists of a single particle line, with an infinite set of possible products of $G_{ij}^0$ and $t_{ij}$. We then average each graph over the distribution of $t_{ij}$. In the $N \to \infty$ limit, only a simple set of graphs survive and the average Green’s function is a solution of the following set of equations

$$G(\omega_n) = \frac{1}{\omega_n + \mu - \Delta(\omega_n)}$$  

(4.6a)

$$\Delta(\tau) = t^2 G(\tau)$$  

(4.6b)

$$G(\tau = 0^-) = Q.$$  

(4.6c)

The solution of Eq. (4.6b) reduces to solving a quadratic equation for $G(z)$, and so we obtain for a complex frequency $z$

$$G(z) = \frac{1}{2t^2} \left[ z + \mu \pm \sqrt{(z + \mu)^2 - 4t^2} \right].$$  

(4.7)

The sign in front of the square root (= sign[Im$(z + \mu)$]) is to be chosen such that $G(z)$ has the correct analytic properties:

- $G(|z| \to \infty) = 1/z$,
- $\text{Im} G(\omega + i0^+) < 0$ for real $\omega$.

All of these constraints can be obtained from the spectral representation of the Green’s function. We can also define the density of single-particle states as

$$\rho(\omega) = -\frac{1}{\pi} \text{Im} G(\omega - \mu + i0^+) = \frac{1}{2\pi t^2} \sqrt{4t^2 - \omega^2}$$  

(4.8)

for $\omega \in [-2t, 2t]$, and $\rho(\omega) = 0$ otherwise. This is the famous Wigner semi-circle density of states for the random matrix (Mehta, 2004).

The chemical potential is fixed by requiring that Eq. (4.6c) is satisfied, which can be written as

$$\int_{-2t}^{2t} d\omega \rho(\omega) f(\omega - \mu) = Q,$$  

(4.9)

where $f(\varepsilon) = 1/(e^\varepsilon/T + 1)$ is the Fermi function. Performing a Sommerfeld expansion of the left-hand side for $T \ll t$, we obtain

$$\int_{-2t}^{2t} d\omega \rho(\omega) + \frac{\pi^2 T^2}{6} \rho'(\mu) = Q.$$  

(4.10)

where $\rho'(\omega) = d\rho/d\omega$. This equation must be satisfied at all $T$, and depending upon the particular ensemble, it requires variation of $\mu$ or $Q$ with $T$. In particular, if we keep $Q$ fixed and vary $T$, then

$$\mu(T) = \mu_0 - \frac{\rho'(\mu_0) \pi^2 T^2}{6}$$  

(4.11)

where $\mu_0 = \mu(T = 0)$.

An alternative way to prove the self-averaging properties is to use the ‘cavity’ construction, which is also a useful method to establish the local effective action associated with interacting models considered later in this article. In a nutshell (see e.g. (Georges et al., 1996) for details), this consists of integrating over all sites $i = 2, \cdots, N$ except site $i = 1$, and noting that the term $\sum_{j > 1} t_{i1} c_i^\dagger c_j$ can be viewed as a source term coupling to $c_1$. Performing the integration over sites is a Gaussian problem in this non-interacting case and leads to the following effective action for site 1:

$$\int d\tau \int d\tau' c_1^\dagger(\tau) [\delta(\tau - \tau') (\partial_\tau - \mu) + \Delta_1(\tau - \tau')] c_1(\tau'),$$  

(4.12)

with

$$\Delta_1(z) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \neq 1} t_{i1}^2 G_{ii}^{[1]}(z) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \neq j, i > 1} t_{i1} t_{1j} G_{ij}^{[1]}(z).$$  

(4.13)

In the above expression, $G_{ij}^{[1]}(z)$ denotes the Green’s function of the lattice with one less site (site 1 removed, $N-1$ sites), also removing all connections to that site. We see that the sum over $i$ in the first term amounts to
a statistical average as $N \to \infty$ and we note, importantly, that $G_{ij}^{(1)}(z)$ does not depend on $t_{ij}$. Hence the two terms under the sum can be averaged independently, yielding $t^2 G$. A similar reasoning shows that the second term vanishes since the average of the $t_{ij}$’s are zero. This proves the self-averaging of the local Green’s function, $G_{11}$. Inverting the quadratic kernel leads to Eq. (4.6b), $G^{-1}(z) = z + \mu - t^2 G(z)$. This also proves that the local one-particle density of states for a given sample $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\lambda} |\langle i|\lambda \rangle|^2 \delta(\epsilon - \epsilon_{\lambda})$ converges with probability 1 to the Wigner semi-circular law in the thermodynamic limit $N \to \infty$. For a given single-particle energy $\epsilon$ within this distribution, one can consider the energy-resolved Green’s function:

$$G(\epsilon, i\omega_n) = \frac{1}{i\omega_n + \mu - \epsilon}$$

which allows to locate the position $\epsilon = \mu$ of the Fermi energy of this random but self-averaging model, and corresponding energy distribution of particles $\theta(\mu - \epsilon)$ at $T = 0$.

**B. Many-body density of states**

A quantity that will play an important role in our subsequent discussion of the SYK model is the *many-body* density of states, $\mathcal{N}(E)$. Unlike the single particle density of states, $\rho(\omega)$, this is not an intensive quantity, but is typically exponentially large in $N$, because there is an exponentially large number of ways of making states within a small window of an energy $E \sim N$. In the grand canonical ensemble, we can relate the grand potential $\Omega(T)$ to $\mathcal{N}(E)$ via an expression for the grand partition function

$$Z = \exp \left( -\frac{\Omega(T)}{T} \right) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dE \mathcal{N}(E) e^{-E/T}.$$ 

(4.15)

Note that we have absorbed a contribution $-\mu N Q$ into the definition of the (grand) energy $E$, as is frequently done in Fermi liquid theory. So we can obtain $\mathcal{N}(E)$ by an inverse Laplace transform of $\Omega(T)$.

First, let us evaluate $\Omega(T)$. By the standard Sommerfeld expansion for free fermions, we have

$$\Omega(T) = -NT \int_{-2\mu}^{2\mu} d\omega \rho(\omega) \ln \left( 1 + e^{-\omega - \mu/T} \right)$$

$$= N \int_{-\mu}^{\mu} d\omega (\omega - \mu) \rho(\omega) - \frac{N\pi^2}{6} T^2 \rho(\mu)$$

$$\equiv E_0 - \frac{N\pi^2}{6} T^2 \rho(\mu).$$

(4.16)

We now have to insert Eq. (4.16) into Eq. (4.15) and determine $\mathcal{N}(E)$. Rather than perform the inverse Laplace transform, we make a guess of the form of $\mathcal{N}(E)$. First, it is not difficult to see that $\mathcal{N}(E < E_0) = 0$. Next, we expect $\mathcal{N}(E)$ to be exponentially large in $N$ when $E - E_0 \sim N$. So we make a guess

$$\mathcal{N}(E) \sim \exp \left( aN[(E - E_0)/N]^b \right), \quad E > E_0$$

(4.17)

for some constants $a$ and $b$. Then we insert Eq. (4.17) into Eq. (4.15), and perform the integral over $E$ by steepest descent method in the large $N$ limit. Matching the
result to the left hand side of Eq. (4.15), we obtain the main result of this section
\[ \mathcal{N}(E) \sim \exp(S(E)) \]  
\[ S(E) = \begin{cases} \pi \sqrt{2N \rho(\mu)(E - E_0)/3}, & E > E_0 \\ 0, & E < E_0 \end{cases}, \]
where \( S(E) \) is the entropy as a function of the energy. Consideration of the derivation shows that this result is valid for
\[ 1 \ll \rho(\mu)(E - E_0) \ll N, \]
in the limit of large \( N \). Note that the entropy vanishes as \( E \to E_0 \) in Eq. (4.18). We show numerical results for \( \mathcal{N}(E) \) for a closely related random Majorana fermion model in Fig. 4. When \( E - E_0 \sim N \), the entropy \( S(E) \) is extensive, the energy level spacing is exponentially small \( \sim e^{-aN} \) with \( a > 0 \), and \( \mathcal{N}(E) \sim e^{pN} \) is exponentially large. However, when \( E - E_0 \sim 1/N \), we expect the energy levels to be few particle excitations with energies \( \sim 1/(N \rho(\mu)) \), and so \( \mathcal{N}(E) \sim N \). This rapid decrease of \( \mathcal{N}(E) \) near the bottom of the band is clearly evident in Fig. 4a from the ‘tails’ in the density of states. A more complete analysis of the finite \( N \) corrections is needed to understand the behavior of the \( \mathcal{N}(E) \) at low energy, along the lines of recent analyses (Liao and Galitski, 2021; Liao et al., 2020).

We also show in Fig. 5 the corresponding results for the Majorana SYK model. These results will be discussed further in Section V.F.2, but for now the reader should note the striking absence of the tails in \( \mathcal{N}(E) \) in Fig. 5a in comparison to Fig. 4a.

There is an interesting interpretation of Eq. (4.18) which gives us some insight into the structure of the random matrix eigenenergies, and also highlights a key characteristic of many body systems with quasiparticle excitations. It is known that the eigenvalues of a random matrix undergo level repulsion and their spacings are rigidly equally spaced, with energy level spacing (near the chemical potential) of \( 1/(N \rho(\mu)) \). Now we ask for the number of ways to create a many body excitation with energy \( E - E_0 \). This many body excitation energy is the sum of particle-hole excitations, each of which has an energy equal to an integer times the level spacing \( 1/(N \rho(\mu)) \):
\[ N \rho(\mu)(E - E_0) = n_1 + n_2 + n_3 + n_4 + \ldots \]
where the \( n_i \) are the excitation numbers of the particle-hole excitations (this mapping is the essence of bosonization in one dimension). So we estimate that the number of such excitations is equal to the number of partitions of the integer \( N \rho(\mu)(E - E_0) \). Now we use the Hardy-Ramanujan result that the number of partitions of an integer \( n \) is \( p(n) \sim \exp(\pi \sqrt{2n/3}) \) at large \( n \). This immediately yields Eq. (4.18).

This argument highlights a key feature of the many-body spectrum: it is just the sum of single particle excitation energies. We expect that if we add four fermion interactions to the random matrix model, we will obtain quasiparticle excitations in a Fermi liquid state whose energies add to give many-particle excitations. This can be checked for weak interactions by a perturbative calculation, and also holds non-perturbatively as shown by dynamical mean-field theory (Georges et al., 1996), which is exact for the random matrix Hubbard model with a local interaction. Therefore, we expect the general form of Eq. (4.18) to continue to hold even with interactions. However, we will see at the end of Section V.F.2 that such a decomposition into quasiparticle excitations does not hold for the SYK model. We can also estimate the lifetime of the quasiparticles at weak coupling by a perturbative computation based on Fermi’s Golden Rule: we obtain \( 1/\tau \sim U^2T^2/t^3 \) at low \( T \) with \( U \) the strength of the local interaction. As this is parametrically smaller than a thermal excitation energy \( \sim T \), quasiparticles remain well-defined excitations. The existence of such quasiparticles can be diagnosed from the poles of the energy-resolved Green’s function to be presented in Eq. (7.8), supplemented by the self-energy as defined in Sec. VII.A to account for interactions, while the energy integrated (local) Green’s function Eq. (4.7) yields the disorder-averaged total density of states.

V. THE SYK MODEL

As in the random matrix model, we consider electrons (assumed spinless for simplicity) which occupy sites labeled \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, N \). However, instead of a random one-particle hopping \( t_{ij} \), we now have only a random two-particle interaction \( U_{ij,kl} \):
\[ H_4 = \frac{1}{(2N)^{3/2}} \sum_{ijkl=1}^{N} U_{ij,kl} c_i^\dagger c_j^\dagger c_k c_l - \mu \sum_i c_i^\dagger c_i \]  
\[ c_i c_j + c_j c_i = 0, \quad c_i c_i^\dagger + c_i^\dagger c_i = \delta_{ij} \]  
\[ Q = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \langle c_i^\dagger c_i \rangle. \]
We choose the couplings \( U_{ij,kl} \) to be independent random variables with zero mean \( \mathbb{E} U_{ij,kl} = 0 \), while satisfying \( U_{ij,kl} = -U_{ji,kl} = -U_{ij,kl}^* = U_{ji,kl} \). All the random variables have the same variance \( \mathbb{E} U_{ij,kl}^2 = U^2 \).

A model similar to \( H_4 \) appeared in nuclear physics, where it was called the two-body random ensemble (Brody et al., 1981), and studied numerically. The existence and structure of the large \( N \) limit was understood (Georges et al., 2000, 2001; Parcollet and Georges, 1999; Sachdev and Ye, 1993) in the context of a closely related
model that we will examine in Section VI. More recently, a Majorana version was introduced (Kitaev, 2015), and the large $N$ limit of $H_4$ was obtained (Sachdev, 2015).

The useful self-averaging properties of the random matrix model as $N \to \infty$ also apply to the SYK model Eq. (5.1a). Indeed, the self-averaging properties are much stronger, as the average takes place over the many-body Hilbert space of size $e^{aN}$, rather than the single-particle Hilbert space of size $N$. Proceeding just as in the random matrix model, we perform a Feynman graph expansion in $U_{ijkl}$, and then average graph-by-graph. In the large $N$ limit, only the so-called ‘melon graphs’ survive (Fig. 6), and the determination of the on-site Green’s function reduces to the solution of the following equations

$$G(i\omega_n) = \frac{1}{i\omega_n + \mu - \Sigma(i\omega_n)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.2a)

$$\Sigma(\tau) = -U^2 G^2(\tau)G(-\tau)$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.2b)

$$G(\tau = 0^+) = Q.$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.2c)

Unlike the random matrix equations, these equations cannot be solved analytically as a result of their non-linearity, and a full solution can only be obtained numerically. However, it is possible to make significant analytic progress at frequencies and temperatures much smaller than $U$, as we shall describe in the following subsections.

![Fig. 6 The ‘melon graph’ for the electron self-energy, $\Sigma(\tau)$, in Eq. (5.2b). Solid lines denote fully dressed electron Green’s functions. The dashed line represents the disorder averaging associated with the interaction vertices (denoted as solid circles), $|U_{ijkl}|^2$.](image)

Before embarking on a general low energy solution of Eq. (5.2a-5.2c), let us note a remarkable feature that can be deduced on general grounds (Sachdev and Ye, 1993): any non-trivial solution (i.e. with $Q \neq 0, 1$) must be gapless. Let us suppose otherwise, and assume there is a gapped solution with $\text{Im} G(\omega) = 0$ for $|\omega| < E_G$. Then, by an examination of the spectral decomposition of the equation for the self energy in Eq. (5.2b), we can establish that $\text{Im} \Sigma(\omega) = 0$ for $|\omega| < 3E_G$. Inserting this back into Dyson’s equation Eq. (5.2a), we obtain the contradictory result that $\text{Im} G(\omega) = 0$ for $|\omega| < 3E_G$. So the only possible value is $E_G = 0$.

### A. Low energy solution at $T = 0$

Knowing that the solution must be gapless, let us assume that we have a power-law singularity at zero frequency. So we assume (Sachdev and Ye, 1993)

$$G(z) = C e^{\frac{-i(\pi\Delta + \theta)}{z^{1-2\Delta}}}, \quad \text{Im}(z) > 0, \quad |z| < U.$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.3)

We have a prefactor $C > 0$, a power-law singularity determined by the exponent $\Delta > 0$, and a spectral asymmetry angle $\theta$ which yields distinct density of states for particle and hole excitations. We now have to insert the ansatz Eq. (5.3) into Eqs. (5.2a,5.2b) and find the values of $\Delta, \theta$ for which there is a self-consistent solution. Of course, the solution also has to satisfy the constraint arising from the spectral representation, $\text{Im} G(\omega + i0^+) < 0$; for Eq. (5.3) this translates to

$$-\pi\Delta < \theta < \pi\Delta.$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.4)

We now wish to obtain the Green’s function as a function of imaginary time $\tau$. For this purpose, we write the spectral representation using the density of states $\rho(\Omega) = -(1/\pi)\text{Im} G(\omega + i0^+) > 0$, so that

$$G(z) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\Omega \frac{\rho(\Omega)}{z - \Omega}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.5)

We can take a Fourier transform and obtain

$$G(\tau) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} -\int_0^{\infty} d\Omega \rho(\Omega)e^{-\Omega\tau}, & \text{for } \tau > 0 \\ \int_0^{\infty} d\Omega \rho(-\Omega)e^{\Omega\tau}, & \text{for } \tau < 0 \end{array} \right.$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.6)

Using Eq. (5.6) we obtain in $\tau$ space

$$G(\tau) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \frac{-C\Gamma(2\Delta)\sin(\pi\Delta + \theta)}{\pi|\tau|^{2\Delta}}, & \text{for } \tau \gg 1/U \\ \frac{C\Gamma(2\Delta)\sin(\pi\Delta - \theta)}{\pi|\tau|^{2\Delta}}, & \text{for } \tau \ll -1/U \end{array} \right.$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.7)

corresponding to the low-frequency behaviour of the spectral function:

$$\rho(\Omega) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \frac{\sin(\pi\Delta + \theta)}{\pi|\Omega|^{1-2\Delta}} C, & \text{for } 0 < \Omega \ll U \\ \frac{\sin(\pi\Delta - \theta)}{\pi|\Omega|^{1-2\Delta}} C, & \text{for } -U \ll \Omega < 0 \end{array} \right.$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.8)

This expression makes it clear that $\theta$ determines the particle-hole asymmetry, associated with the fermion propagation forward and backward in time (positive/negative frequencies). For our later purpose, it is also useful to parametrize the asymmetry in terms of a real number $-\infty < \mathcal{E} < \infty$ so that

$$G(\tau) \sim \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} -e^{\pi\mathcal{E}} |\tau|^{-\Delta}, & \text{for } \tau \gg 1/U \\ e^{-\pi\mathcal{E}} |\tau|^{-\Delta}, & \text{for } \tau \ll -1/U \end{array} \right.$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.9)
and then we have
\[ e^{2\pi \epsilon} = \frac{\sin(\pi \Delta + \theta)}{\sin(\pi \Delta - \theta)}, \] (5.10)
and \( \epsilon = \theta = 0 \) is the particle-hole symmetric case. This spectral asymmetry plays a key role in the physics of the complex SYK model, as well as in the large-\( M \) solution of multichannel Kondo models (Parcollet et al., 1998), where the notation \( \alpha = 2\pi \epsilon \) was used.

We also use the spectral representation for the self energy
\[ \Sigma(z) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\Omega \frac{\sigma(\Omega)}{\omega - \Omega}. \] (5.11)
Using Eqs. (5.2b) and (5.7) to obtain \( \Sigma(\tau) \), and performing the inverse Laplace transform as for \( G(\tau) \), we obtain
\[ \sigma(\Omega) = \begin{cases} 
\Upsilon(\Delta) [\sin(\pi \Delta + \theta)]^2 [\sin(\pi \Delta - \theta)] [\Omega]^{6\Delta-1} & \text{for } \Omega > 0 \, \\
\Upsilon(\Delta) [\sin(\pi \Delta + \theta)] [\sin(\pi \Delta - \theta)]^2 [\Omega]^{6\Delta-1} & \text{for } \Omega < 0 \end{cases} \tag{5.12}
\]
where \( \Upsilon(\Delta) = \frac{\pi^2 U^2}{\Gamma(6\Delta)} CT(2\Delta)/\pi^3 \). Finally we have to insert the \( \Sigma(\omega_n) \) obtained from Eqs. (5.11) and (5.12) back into Eq. (5.2a). To understand the structure of the solution, let us first assume that \( 0 < 6\Delta - 1 < 1 \); we will find soon that this is indeed the case, and no other solution is possible. Then as \( |\omega_n| \to 0 \), the frequency dependence in \( \Sigma(\omega_n) \) is much larger than that from the \( \omega_n \) term in Eq. (5.2a). Also, we have \( 1 - 2\Delta > 0 \), and so \( G(z) \) in Eq. (5.3) diverges as \( |z| \to 0 \). So we find that a solution of Eq. (5.2a) is only possible under two conditions:
\[ \mu - \Sigma(0) = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad 1 - 2\Delta = 6\Delta - 1 \Rightarrow \Delta = \frac{1}{4}. \] (5.13)
Matching the divergence in the coefficient of \( G(z) \) as \( z \to 0 \), we also obtain the value of \( C \):
\[ C = \left( \frac{\pi}{U^2 \cos(2\theta)} \right)^{1/4}. \] (5.14)
The value of asymmetry angle, \( \theta \), remains undetermined by the solution Eqs. (5.2a) and (5.2b). As we will see in Section V.B, the value of \( \theta \) is fixed by a generalized Luttinger’s theorem, which relates it to the value of the fermion density \( Q \) (Georges et al., 2001). But without further computation we can conclude that at the particle-hole symmetric point with \( Q = 1/2 \), we have \( \epsilon = \theta = 0 \).

The main result of this section is therefore summarized in Eq. (5.9). The fermion has ‘dimension’ \( \Delta = 1/4 \) and its two-point correlator decays as \( 1/\sqrt{\tau} \); there is a particle-hole asymmetry determined by \( \epsilon \) (which is unknown at this stage, but determined in the next section). This should be contrasted with the corresponding features of the random matrix model with a Fermi liquid ground state: the two-point fermion correlator decays as \( 1/\tau \), and the leading decay is particle-hole symmetric.

**B. Luttinger’s theorem**

In Fermi liquid theory, Luttinger’s theorem relates an equal time property — the total electron density — to a low energy property, the Fermi wavevector which is the location of zero energy excitations. There turns out to be a similar low/high energy mapping that can be made in a ‘generalized’ Luttinger theorem for the SYK model, relating the angle \( \theta \) characterizing the particle-hole asymmetry at long times in Eq. (5.3), to the fermion density \( Q \) (Georges et al., 2001). As in the conventional Luttinger analysis, we start by manipulating the expression for \( Q \) into 2 terms
\[ Q - 1 = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega G(i\omega)e^{-i\omega0^+} = I_1 + I_2, \]
\[ I_1 = i \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \ln [G(i\omega)] e^{-i\omega0^+}, \]
\[ I_2 = -i \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} G(i\omega) \frac{d}{d\omega} \Sigma(i\omega)e^{-i\omega0^+}. \] (5.15)
In Fermi liquid theory, \( I_2 \) vanishes because of the existence of the Luttinger-Ward functional (Abrikosov et al., 1963; Luttinger and Ward, 1960), while \( I_1 \) is easily evaluated because it is a total derivative, and this yields the Luttinger theorem. The situation is more complicated for the SYK model because of the singular nature of \( G(\omega) \) as \( |\omega| \to 0 \). Indeed, both \( I_1 \) and \( I_2 \) are logarithmically divergent at small \( |\omega| \), although, naturally, their sum is well defined. Nevertheless the separation of \( Q \) into \( I_1 \) and \( I_2 \) is useful, because it allows us to use the special properties of the Luttinger-Ward functional to account for the unknown high frequency behavior of the Green’s function.

We shall define \( I_{1,2} \) by a regularization procedure, and it is then important that the same regularization be used for both \( I_1 \) and \( I_2 \). We employ the symmetric principle value, with
\[ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \Rightarrow \lim_{\eta \to 0} \left[ \int_{-\infty}^{-\eta} d\omega + \int_{\eta}^{\infty} d\omega \right]. \] (5.16)

Now we evaluate \( I_1 \) using the usual procedure: we distort the contour of integration to the real frequency axis and obtain
\[ I_1 = i \lim_{\eta \to 0} \int_0^{\infty} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \frac{d}{d\omega} \ln \frac{G(\omega + i\eta)}{G(\omega - i\eta)} \]
\[ = -i \lim_{\eta \to 0} [\arg G(\infty + i\eta) - \arg G(i\eta)] . \] (5.17)
In a Fermi liquid, \( I_1 \) now evaluates to unity outside the Fermi surface, and vanishes inside the Fermi surface. In
Indeed, the explicit evaluation yields:

\[ I_1 = -\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\theta}{\pi}, \quad \text{(5.18)} \]

In the evaluation of \( I_2 \) we must substitute the expression Eq. (5.2b) for \( \Sigma \) into \( I_2 \), because then we ensure cancellations at high frequencies arising from the existence of the Luttinger-Ward functional:

\[ \Phi_{LW}[G] = -\frac{U^2}{4} \int d\tau \, G^2(\tau)G^2(-\tau). \quad \text{(5.19)} \]

Using \( \Sigma = \delta \Phi_{LW}/\delta G \), and ignoring the singularity at \( \omega = 0 \), we obtain, as in Fermi liquid theory, \( I_2 = -i \int \omega d\omega (d/d\omega)\phi_{LW} = 0 \). So the entire contribution to \( I_2 \) arises from the regularization of singularity near \( \omega = 0 \). We can therefore evaluate \( I_2 \) by using Eq. (5.2b) for \( \Sigma \), the regularization in Eq. (5.16), and the low frequency spectral density in Eq. (5.12), and ignore the high frequency contribution to \( I_2 \). The explicit evaluation of the integral is somewhat involved (Georges et al., 2001; Gu et al., 2020). The result can be guessed however from a heuristic argument (Georges et al., 2001), which can also be generalized to the SYK model with \( q \)-fermion interactions (Davison et al., 2017). The low-energy contribution to \( I_2 \) involves a product of \( G \) and \( \Sigma \) and must be a homogeneous polynomial of degree 4 in the two coefficients that enter the low-energy behaviour of \( G \), Eq. (5.8). Using particle-hole symmetry, and imposing that the absence of singularity as \( \theta \to \pm \pi/4 \), it is seen that only the combination

\[ C^4 \left[ \sin^3 \left( \frac{3}{4} \theta \right) - \sin^3 \left( \frac{\pi}{4} - \theta \right) \right] \propto \sin 2\theta \text{ is allowed.} \]

The proportionality coefficient is fixed by imposing that \( Q = +1 \) for \( \theta = -\pi/4 \) in Eq. (5.15). Indeed, the explicit evaluation yields:

\[ I_2 = -\frac{\sin(2\theta)}{4}. \quad \text{(5.20)} \]

Combining Eqs. (5.15,5.18,5.20), we obtain our generalized Luttinger theorem (Davison et al., 2017; Georges et al., 2001; Gu et al., 2020),

\[ Q = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\theta}{\pi} - \frac{\sin(2\theta)}{4}. \quad \text{(5.21)} \]

This expression evaluates to the limiting values \( Q = 1,0 \) for the limiting values of \( \theta = -\pi/4, \pi/4 \) in Eq. (5.4), and decreases monotonically in between; \( Q \) is also a monotonically decreasing function between these limits of \(-\infty < \mathcal{E} < \infty \), via Eq. (5.10).

All our results have so far been obtained by an analytic analysis of the low energy behavior. A numerical analysis is needed to ensure that such low energy solutions have high energy continuations which also obey Eqs. (5.2a,5.2b). Such analyses show that complete solutions only exist for a range of values around \( Q = 1/2 \) (Azeyanagi et al., 2018); for values of \( Q \) close to 0,1 there is phase separation into the trivial \( Q = 0,1 \) state, and densities closer to half-filling. However, this conclusion is only for the specific microscopic Hamiltonian in Eq. (5.1a): other Hamiltonians, with additional \( q \)-fermion terms (see Appendix F), with \( q > 4 \), could have solutions with the same low energy behavior described so far for a wider range of \( Q \), because these higher \( q \) terms are irrelevant at low energy.

### C. Non-zero temperatures

It turns out to be possible to extend the solutions for \( T = 0 \) Green’s functions obtained so far to non-zero \( T \ll U \) by employing a subtle argument involving conformal invariance. However, let us first take a simple minded approach to look for a solution directly from Eq. (5.2a) and Eq. (5.2b), and show that we can guess a solution.

We initially limit consideration to the particle-hole symmetric case with \( Q = 1/2 \) and \( \theta = 0 \). We use the similarity to multichannel Kondo problems (Parcollet et al., 1998), to generalize the \( \tau \) dependence of the Green’s function in Eq. (5.7) to (Parcollet and Georges, 1999)

\[ G(\tau) = B \text{sgn}(\tau) \left| \frac{\pi T}{\sin(\pi T\tau)} \right|^{1/2}, \quad T,|\tau|^{-1} \ll U, \quad \text{(5.22)} \]

where \( B \) is some \( T \)-independent constant. Making contact with the notations of Sec. V.A, \( B = C \Gamma(1/2) \sin(\pi/4)/\pi = C/\sqrt{2\pi} \), with \( C^4 = \pi/U^2 \) for this case with \( \theta = 0 \). Note that Eq. (5.22) reduces to Eq. (5.7) for \( 1/U \ll |\tau| \ll 1/T \). Then the self-energy is

\[ \Sigma(\tau) = U^2 B^4 \text{sgn}(\tau) \left| \frac{\pi T}{\sin(\pi T\tau)} \right|^{3/2}, \quad T,|\tau|^{-1} \ll U. \]

Taking Fourier transforms, we have as a function of the Matsubara frequency \( \omega_n \)

\[ G(i\omega_n) = \left[ iB \right] \frac{T^{-1/2} \Gamma \left( \frac{1}{4} + \frac{\omega_n}{2\pi T} \right)}{\Gamma \left( \frac{3}{4} + \frac{\omega_n}{2\pi T} \right)}, \quad \text{(5.23a)} \]

\[ \Sigma_{\text{sing}}(i\omega_n) = \left[ i4\pi U^2 B^4 \right] \frac{T^{1/2} \Gamma \left( \frac{3}{4} + \frac{\omega_n}{2\pi T} \right)}{\Gamma \left( \frac{1}{4} + \frac{\omega_n}{2\pi T} \right)}, \quad \text{(5.23b)} \]

where we have subtracted \( \Sigma(\omega = 0, T = 0) \) in \( \Sigma_{\text{sing}}(i\omega_n) \). Now the singular part of Dyson’s equation is

\[ G(i\omega_n)\Sigma_{\text{sing}}(i\omega_n) = -1. \quad \text{(5.24)} \]

Remarkably, the \( \Gamma \) functions in Eqs. (5.23a) and (5.23b) appear with just the right arguments, so that they can obey Eq. (5.24) for all \( \omega_n \), and the amplitude indeed obeys \( 4\pi U^2 B^4 = 1 \).
A deeper understanding of the origin of Eq. (5.22), and its generalization to the particle-hole asymmetric case, can be obtained by analyzing the low energy limit of the original saddle point equations Eqs. (5.2a) and (5.2b). These equations are characterized by a remarkably large set of emergent symmetries, which we describe in Appendix A. The final result for the Green’s function in imaginary time away from the particle-hole symmetric point is

\[ G(\tau) = -C \frac{e^{-2\pi ET\tau}}{\sqrt{1 + e^{-4\pi E}}} \left( \frac{T}{\sin(\pi T\tau)} \right)^{1/2}. \]  

(5.25)

for \( 0 < \tau < \frac{1}{T} \). This can be extended to all real \( \tau \) using the KMS condition Eq. (A5). Performing a Fourier transform, and analytically continuing to real frequencies leads to the Green’s function (Parcollet and Georges, 1999; Sachdev, 2015)

\[ G(\omega + i0^+) = \frac{-iC e^{-i\delta\mu}}{(2\pi T)^{1/2}} \frac{1}{\Gamma} e^{(\omega / 2\pi T)} \left( \frac{i\omega}{2\pi T} \right) \left( \frac{1 + iE - i\omega}{2\pi T} \right) \]  

(5.26)

We show a plot of the imaginary part of the Green’s function in Fig. 7.

For later comparison with other models, let us note that these results imply that the singular part of the electron self energy in Eq. (5.23b) obeys the scaling form

\[ \Sigma(\omega, T) = U^{1/2}T^{1/2} \Phi \left( \frac{\hbar \omega}{k_B T} \right) \]  

(5.27)

where \( \Phi \) is a universal scaling function with a known dependence on the particle-hole asymmetry parameter \( E \).

The universal dependence of the self energy on the Planckian ratio, \( \hbar \omega / (k_B T) \), implies the absence of electronic quasiparticles (Sachdev, 1999): the characteristic lifetime of the excitations \( \sim \hbar / (k_B T) \) is of the same order as their energy \( \sim \hbar \omega \), and so quasiparticles are not well defined. This behaviour is very different from the random matrix model studied in Section IV.B where the self-energy was negligible at low \( T \).

A Planckian lifetime has also been obtained by non-equilibrium studies of SYK models, which display a recovery of thermal Green’s functions in a time that is independent of \( U \), and proportional to the inverse final temperature (Almheiri et al., 2019; Bhattacharya et al., 2019; Dhar et al., 2019; Eberlein et al., 2017; Kourkoulou and Maldacena, 2017; Lensky and Qi, 2021; Rossini et al., 2020; Samui and Sorokhaibam, 2021; Zhang, 2019); for closely related and complementary insights, see also (Bandyopadhyay et al., 2021; Cheiash et al., 2020; Halder et al., 2020; Haque and McClarty, 2019; Kuhlenkamp and Knap, 2020; Larzul and Schirò, 2021; Sonner and Vielma, 2017).

D. Computation of the \( T \to 0 \) entropy

We have now presented detailed information on the nature of the Green’s function of the SYK model at low \( T \). We will proceed next to use this information to compute some key features of the low \( T \) thermodynamics.

First, we establish some properties of the behavior of the chemical potential, \( \mu \), as \( T \to 0 \) at fixed \( \mu \). Recall that for the random matrix model, and more generally for any Fermi liquid, there was a \( \sim T^2 \) correction to the chemical potential, which depended upon the derivative of the density of single particle states. For the SYK model, the leading correction is much stronger; the correction \( \sim T \), which is universally related to parameters in the Green’s function (Georges et al., 2001).

A simple way to determine the linear \( T \) dependence of \( \mu \) is to examine the particle-hole asymmetry of the Green’s function at \( T > 0 \). From Eqs. (5.9), (5.25) this is given by the ratio

\[ \lim_{T \to 0} \frac{G(\tau)}{G(1/T - \tau)} = e^{2\pi E}, \]  

(5.28)

where the limit is taken at a fixed \( \tau \gg 1/U \). We now use a crude picture of the low energy, and imagine that all the low degrees of freedom are essentially at zero energy, compared to \( U \). So we compare Eq. (5.28) with the corresponding ratio for a zero energy fermion whose chemical potential has been shifted by \( \delta \mu \)

\[ \frac{G(\tau)}{G(1/T - \tau)} = e^{-(\delta \mu / T)}. \]  

(5.29)

From this comparison, we conclude that there is a linear-in-\( T \) dependence of the chemical potential that keeps the particle-hole asymmetry fixed as \( T \to 0 \):

\[ \mu - \mu_0 = \delta \mu = -2\pi E T \]  

+ terms vanishing as \( T^p \) with \( p > 1 \). (5.30)
with $\mu_0$ a non-universal constant. Note that the density of the zero energy fermion $= 1/(e^{-\delta\mu/T} + 1)$ remains fixed as $T \to 0$, and so Eq. (5.30) applies at fixed $Q$.

A more formal analysis (Georges et al., 2001; Parcollet et al., 1998; Sachdev, 2015), leading to the same result for the $T$ dependence of $\mu$, relates the long-time conformal Green’s function (valid for $\tau \gg 1/U$) to its short-time behavior. In particular at $|\omega_n| \gg U$ we have

$$G(\omega_n) = \frac{1}{i\omega_n} - \frac{\mu}{(i\omega_n)^2} + \ldots$$ (5.31)

which implies for the spectral density of the Green’s function, $\rho(\Omega)$

$$\mu = -\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\Omega \Omega \rho(\Omega),$$ (5.32)

which makes it evident that $\mu$ depends only upon the particle-hole asymmetric part of the spectral density. Next, using the spectral relations we can relate the $\Omega$ integrals to the derivative of the imaginary time correlator

$$\mu = -\partial_\tau G(\tau = 0^+) - \partial_\tau G(\tau = (1/T)^-).$$ (5.33)

We pull out an explicitly particle-hole asymmetric part of $G(\tau)$ by defining

$$G(\tau) = e^{-2\pi\mathcal{E}T\tau}G_c(\tau), \quad 0 < \sigma < \frac{1}{T},$$ (5.34)

where $G_c$ will be given by a particle-hole symmetric conformal form at low $T$ and low $\omega$. Then we obtain

$$\mu = 2\pi\mathcal{E}T \left[ G(\tau = 0^+) + G(\tau = (1/T)^-) \right] - \partial_\tau g(\tau = 0^+)$$

+ terms dependent on $G_c$

$$= -2\pi\mathcal{E}T + \text{terms dependent on } G_c$$

It can be shown that all the terms dependent upon $G_c$ have a $T$ dependence that is weaker than linear in $T$ provided $Q$ is held fixed. Hence, we obtain Eq. (5.30).

Now we can deduce the $T$ dependence of the entropy by the Maxwell relation

$$\left( \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial T} \right)_Q = -\frac{1}{N} \left( \frac{\partial S}{\partial Q} \right)_T,$$ (5.35)

where the $1/N$ is needed because we define $S$ to be the total extensive entropy, and so we must use the total number $NQ$ in the Maxwell relation. Applying this to Eq. (5.30) we obtain

$$\frac{1}{N} \left( \frac{\partial S}{\partial Q} \right)_T = 2\pi\mathcal{E} \neq 0 \quad \text{as } T \to 0.$$ (5.36)

In Section V.B, we obtained an ‘extended’ Luttinger relationship between the density $Q$ and the particle-hole asymmetry parameter $\mathcal{E}$. Assuming that $S = 0$ at $Q = 0$,

we can now integrate Eq. (5.36) to obtain for the entropy $S$ (Georges et al., 2001)

$$S(T \to 0) = NS, \quad S = 2\pi \int_0^Q d\tilde{Q} \mathcal{E}(\tilde{Q}).$$ (5.37)

which can be rewritten, using Eqs. (5.10) and (5.21) in the following parametric form:

$$S(\Theta) = \int_{-\pi/4}^{\Theta} d\theta \ln \left( \frac{\sin(\pi/4 + \Theta)}{\sin(\pi/4 - \Theta)} \right) \frac{\partial Q}{\partial \theta},$$ (5.38)

$$Q(\Theta) = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\Theta}{\pi} - \frac{\sin 2\Theta}{4}.$$ (5.39)

Fig. 8 displays the entropy density vs. $Q$ obtained from this expression.

The remarkable feature of this result is that the entropy $S$ is extensive, i.e. proportional to $N$, as $T \to 0$. Specifically, we have

$$\lim_{T \to 0} \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{S}{N} \neq 0.$$ (5.40)

The order of limits is crucial here; the above order of limits defines the zero temperature entropy density, in which the thermodynamic limit is taken before the zero temperature limit. If we had taken the other order of limits, we would obtain the ground state entropy density, which does indeed vanish.

### E. Corrections to scaling

All of our low energy results for the SYK model have so far been obtained in a scaling limit in which the $i\omega_n$ term in the Green’s function in Eq. (5.2a) was neglected, as discussed above Eq. (5.13). This subsection will consider the structure of the corrections that arise when this $i\omega_n$ term is included. We emphasize that all of the computations here are in the $N = \infty$ limit, and we are computing corrections to the low energy approximation to the saddle point equations. A significant result of our
computations will be $T$-dependent corrections to the entropy in Eq. (5.37); these will continue to be proportional to $N$. We will consider finite $N$ corrections to such saddle point results in Section V.F.

To understand the structure of the possible corrections, we postulate that the low energy corrections can be computed from an effective action of the following form:

$$ I = I_0 + \sum_h g_h \int_0^\beta d\tau O_h(\tau) $$

(5.41)

where $O_h$ are a set of scaling operators with scaling dimension $h$. One of our tasks for the subsection is to determine the possible values of $h$, and we will accomplish this shortly. The term $I_0$ is the leading critical theory which leads to the results described so far; in particular to the Green’s function in Eqs. (5.3) and (5.26), and the entropy in Eq. (5.37). We normalize the perturbing operators by the two-point correlator

$$ \langle O_h(\tau)O_h(0) \rangle = \frac{1}{|\tau|^d}, $$

(5.42)

then the co-efficient $g_h$ is fully specified. In general, the $g_h$ are a set of non-universal numbers of order $U^{1-h}$, whose precise values depend upon the details of the underlying theory e.g. on possible higher-order fermion interaction terms we can add to the SYK Hamiltonian.

Given Eq. (5.41), we can easily estimate the form of the corrections to the grand potential $\Omega(T)$. We expect that

$$ \langle O_h \rangle_{T^*} = \Omega_h T^h, $$

(5.43)

where the expectation value is evaluated at a temperature $T$ in $I_0$, and the $T$-dependence follows from the scaling dimension of $O_h$. Taking the expectation value of the action, we obtain

$$ \Omega(T) = E_0 - NST + \sum_h g_h \Omega_h T^h $$

(5.44)

where $E_0$ is the ground state energy, $S$ is the entropy in Eq. (5.37), and the set of co-efficients $\Omega_h$ were specified in Eq. (5.43). Similarly, we can write the corrections to the Green’s function in Eq. (5.7) from the $O_h$ perturbations:

$$ G(\tau) = G_*(\tau) \left( 1 + \sum_h \frac{\Omega_h}{|\tau|^{d-h}} \right), $$

(5.45)

where we now use $G_*$ to denote the leading order result in Eq. (5.22), and we have used $\dim[g_h] = 1 - h$ from Eq. (5.41). Here, and below, we will limit ourselves to the particle-hole symmetric case with $\theta = 0$, $\mu = 0$, $\xi = 0$, and refer to Ref. (Tikhanovskaya et al., 2021a) for the general case. The co-efficients $\Omega_h$ and $\alpha_h$ are universal dimensionless numbers.

Our remaining task here is to determine the allowed values of $h$. We follow Refs. (Gross and Rosenhaus, 2017; Klebanov et al., 2018; Klebanov and Tarnopolsky, 2017), and we only consider the ‘antisymmetric’ operators $O_h$ which are represented at short times by $O_h = c_i \partial_{\tau}^{2n+1} c_i$ with $n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$. The needed information is contained in the three point functions

$$ v_h(\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_0) = \langle c(\tau_1) c(\tau_2) O_h(\tau_0) \rangle. $$

(5.46)

In the large $N$ limit, this three point function obeys the integral equation shown in Fig. 9. In the long time scaling limit, we can drop the bare first term on the right hand side, and then Fig. 9 reduces to the eigenvalue equation (Gross and Rosenhaus, 2017)

$$ k(h) v(\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_0) = \int d\tau_d d\tau_4 K(\tau_1, \tau_2; \tau_3, \tau_4) v_h(\tau_3, \tau_4, \tau_0), $$

(5.47)

where the kernel $K$ is

$$ K(\tau_1, \tau_2; \tau_3, \tau_4) = -3U^2 G_*(\tau_{13}) G_*(\tau_{24}) G_*(\tau_{34})^2, $$

(5.48)

with $\tau_{ij} \equiv \tau_i - \tau_j$, and we have introduced an eigenvalue $k(h)$ by hand which must obey

$$ k(h) = 1. $$

(5.49)

The solution of Eq. (5.47) is aided by an assumption of conformal symmetry, aspects of which will be discussed in Appendix A. With these assumptions, the three point functions are expected to obey the functional form (Gross and Rosenhaus, 2017)

$$ v(\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_0) = \frac{c_h B \text{sgn}(\tau_{12})}{|\tau_{12}|^{1/2-k}|\tau_{10}|^h|\tau_{20}|^h}, $$

(5.50)

where we have introduced a set of dimensionless ‘structure constants’ $c_h$. Inserting Eqs. (5.48) and (5.50) into Eq. (5.47), and evaluating the integrals over $\tau_3$ and $\tau_4$ in the limit $\tau_0 \to \infty$, we find that Eq. (5.47) yields the eigenvalue

$$ k(h) = \frac{3 \tan(\pi h/2 - \pi/4)}{2h - 1}. $$

(5.51)
The solution of Eqs. (5.49) and (5.51) finally yields the needed values of $h$. There are an infinite number of solutions, and the lowest values are

$$h = 2, \ 3.77354 \ldots, 5.567946 \ldots, 7.63197 \ldots (5.52)$$

Only the lowest value $h = 2$ is an integer, and all higher values are irrational numbers.

We will have a particular interest here in the $h = 2$ operator. This plays a special role in the finite $N$ fluctuations, and leads eventually to a violation of scaling, as will be discussed in Section V.F. At $N = \infty$, it is also the lowest dimension operator, and so yields the most important corrections to Eqs. (5.44) and (5.45). For the entropy at fixed $Q$, we can take a derivative of Eq. (5.44), and write the correction to Eq. (5.37) as (Gu et al., 2020; Kitaev and Suh, 2017; Maldacena and Stanford, 2016)

$$S(T \to 0, Q) = N [S + \gamma T] ,$$  

(5.53)

where $\gamma \sim 1/U$ is the non-universal co-efficient of the linear-in-$T$ specific heat at fixed $Q$, a quantity familiar from Fermi liquid theory. The SYK non-Fermi liquid has a similar specific heat; but note the presence of the from Fermi liquid theory. The SYK non-Fermi liquid

F. Finite $N$ Fluctuations

This section will turn to a theory of the fluctuations about the large $N$ saddle point examined so far. We will focus on the corrections to the result for the entropy in Eqs. (5.37,5.53). The dominant finite $N$ corrections arise from a universal, exactly soluble theory for the low energy fluctuations about the large $N$ saddle point. Along the way, we will also obtain an example of the corrections discussed in Section V.E associated with irrelevant operators in the $N = \infty$ saddle point theory. This will lead to the $T$-dependent correction in Eq. (5.53), and allow us to identify $\gamma$ with a coupling in the effective action.

We begin with a path integral representation of the underlying SYK Hamiltonian Eq. (5.1a). To treat the random couplings, we need to perform a quenched average using the replica method. However, the strongly self-averaging properties we shall compute below do not depend upon the replica structure, and so we will simply ignore these technicalities, and work directly with the averaged theory. So after averaging over the $U_{ijk\ell}$, the path integral becomes

$$Z = \int Dc_i(\tau) \exp \left[ - \sum_i \int_0^\beta d\tau_1 c_i^\dagger \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} - \mu \right) c_i + \frac{U^2}{4N^3} \int_0^\beta d\tau_1 d\tau_2 \left| \frac{1}{2} \sum_i c_i^\dagger(\tau_1) c_i(\tau_2) \right|^4 \right] ,$$  

(5.54)

where $\beta = 1/T$. We now introduce the following ‘trivial’ identity in the path integral,

$$1 = \int DG(\tau_1, \tau_2) D\Sigma(\tau_1, \tau_2)$$

$$\times \exp \left[ - N \int_0^\beta d\tau_1 d\tau_2 \Sigma(\tau_1, \tau_2) \frac{1}{U} \right] \left( G(\tau_2, \tau_1) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_i c_i(\tau_2)c_i^\dagger(\tau_1) \right) .$$  

(5.55)

and interchange orders of integration. Then the partition function can be written as a ‘$G - \Sigma$’ theory, a path integral with an action $I[G, \Sigma]$ for the Green’s function and the self energy analogous to a Luttinger-Ward functional (Georges et al., 2001; Kitaev and Suh, 2017; Maldacena and Stanford, 2016).

$$Z = \int DG(\tau_1, \tau_2) D\Sigma(\tau_1, \tau_2) \exp \left[ -NI[G, \Sigma] \right]$$

$$I[G, \Sigma] = - \ln \det \left[ (\partial_{\tau_1} - \mu)\delta(\tau_1 - \tau_2) + \Sigma(\tau_1, \tau_2) \right]$$

$$- \text{Tr} (\Sigma \cdot G) - \frac{U^2}{4} \text{Tr} (G^2 \cdot G^2) .$$  

(5.56)

We have integrated over the fermions to obtain the $\ln \det$ term. This is an exact representation of the averaged partition function. Notice that it involves $G$ and $\Sigma$ as bilocal fields that depend upon two times, and we have introduced a compact notation for such fields:

$$\text{Tr} (f \cdot g) \equiv \int d\tau_1 d\tau_2 f(\tau_2, \tau_1) g(\tau_1, \tau_2) .$$  

(5.57)

See Appendix A for a discussion of the symmetries of the bilocal fields, where we also show that after ignoring the explicit time derivative in Eq. (5.56), the action is invariant under time reparameterization and gauge symmetries (Eq. (A2c)).

The path integral in Eq. (5.56) is complicated to be evaluated, in general. We now make a low energy approximation by integrating only along directions in the vast ($G, \Sigma$) space where the variation $S[G, \Sigma]$ is small at low energies (Kitaev and Suh, 2017; Maldacena and Stanford, 2016). Given the unimportance of the $\partial_\tau$ in Eq. (5.56), and the resulting symmetries of the action, a powerful conclusion is that we need only perform the path integral along trajectories where the Green’s function obeys Eq. (B2) (and similarly for the self energy). In this manner, we formally call the $G-\Sigma$ path integral into a path integral over the time reparameterization $f(\tau)$ and the gauge transformation $\phi(\tau)$ (Davison et al., 2017; Gu et al., 2020; Kitaev and Suh, 2017; Maldacena and Stanford, 2016).

$$Z \approx e^{-E_0/T + NS} \int Df(\tau) D\phi(\tau) \exp \left( -NI_{\text{eff}}[f, \phi] \right) ,$$  

(5.58)
where \( E_0 \propto N \) is the ground state energy (including the \(-\mu QN\) contribution). We will shortly deduce the form of \( I_{\text{eff}}[f, \phi] \) from symmetry arguments. But before we turn to that, let us note that the combination of Eqs. (B2) and (5.58) also yield the most important contributions to the fluctuation corrections to the Green’s function

\[
G(\tau_1 - \tau_2) = \frac{e^{-E_0/T + N S}}{2} \int Df(\tau) D\phi(\tau) \times \exp \left(-N I_{\text{eff}}[f, \phi]\right) \left[f'(\tau_1)f'(\tau_2)\right]^{1/4} \times G_c(f(\tau_1) - f(\tau_2)) e^{i\phi(\tau_1)-i\phi(\tau_2)},
\]

where the conformal saddle-point Green’s function \( G_c(\tau) \) is given by Eq. (5.25).

Now our task is to determine the action \( I_{\text{eff}}[f, \phi] \), and then evaluate the path integrals in Eqs. (5.58) and (5.59). It turns out the partition function for the free energy in Eq. (5.58) can be evaluated exactly. The consequences of the path integral in Eq. (5.59) for the long-time behavior of \( G(\tau) \) have also been investigated (Aitland et al., 2019b; Bagrets et al., 2016, 2017; Kitaev and Suh, 2017; Kitaev, 2015; Kobrin et al., 2021; Kruchkov et al., 2020; Maldacena and Stanford, 2016): they lead to a violation of scaling times of order \( N/U \), but we will not describe this further here.

The form of \( I_{\text{eff}}[f, \phi] \) is strongly constrained by the requirement that \( I \) vanish for the case where \( f(\tau) \) and \( \phi(\tau) \) are given by Eq. (B3). This follows immediately from the fact that Eq. (B3) leads to no changes in the form of the saddle point Green’s function when inserted into Eq. (B2). As the action was originally a functional of the Green’s function, it can also not change. The action \( I_{\text{eff}}[f, \phi] \) with the smallest number of derivatives that satisfies this requirement is (Davison et al., 2017; Gu et al., 2020; Kitaev and Suh, 2017; Maldacena and Stanford, 2016)

\[
I_{\text{eff}}[f, \phi] = \frac{NK}{2} \int_0^\beta d\tau \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial \tau} + i(2\pi E T) \frac{\partial f}{\partial \tau} \right)^2 - \frac{N\gamma}{4\pi^2} \int_0^\beta d\tau \left\{ \tan(\pi T f(\tau)), \tau \right\}. \tag{5.60}
\]

The curly brackets in Eq. (5.60) represent a Schwarzian derivative:

\[
\{ g, \tau \} \equiv \frac{g'''}{g'} - \frac{3}{2} \left( \frac{g''}{g'} \right)^2. \tag{5.61}
\]

This has the defining property that

\[
\left\{ \frac{a\tau + b}{c\tau + d}, \tau \right\} = 0, \tag{5.62}
\]

which ensures that \( I_{\text{eff}}[f, \phi] \) vanishes for Eq. (B3). (We note that there are coupled SYK models which are not described by a Schwarzian effective action (Maldacena et al., 2016b; Milekhin, 2021).)

For the origin of \( f(\tau) \) and \( \phi(\tau) \) as time reparameterization and gauge transformations of the Green’s function, we must also place some constraints on that nature of the path integral over them. The function \( f(\tau) \) must be monotonic, and obey

\[
f(\tau + \beta) = f(\tau) + \beta. \tag{5.63}
\]

Moreover, we should sum over all possible phase windings with

\[
\phi(\tau + \beta) = \phi(\tau) + 2\pi n \tag{5.64}
\]

where \( n \) is an integer.

The action in Eq. (5.60) has 2 dimensionful coupling constants, \( K \) and \( \gamma \). By dimensional analysis, we can see that \( \gamma \sim 1/U \), the only energy scale at \( T = 0 \). Determining the precise values of \( K \) and \( \gamma \) is not simple, and requires a numerical study of the higher energy properties of the SYK model. We will now relate the values of \( K \) and \( \gamma \) to thermodynamic observables of the \( N = \infty \) theory, and numerical computation of these observables is usually the simplest way to determine \( K \) and \( \gamma \).

At \( T = 0 \), the action for \( \phi \) represents the path integral of a particle of mass \( NK \) moving on a ring of circumference \( 2\pi \). So the energy levels are \( \ell^2/(2NK) \), where the integer \( \ell \) measures the total fermion number. With a chemical potential shift \( \delta \mu \), the energy levels will shift as \( \ell^2/(2NK) - \delta \mu \ell \). From the optimum value of this function for different \( \ell \), we conclude that \( K \) is the just the compressibility

\[
K = \frac{dQ}{d\mu}, \quad T = 0. \tag{5.65}
\]

Turning to the value of \( \gamma \), note that the action \( I_{\text{eff}}[f, \phi] \) does not vanish at the \( N = \infty \) saddle point \( f(\tau) = \tau \). Evaluating Eq. (5.60) for this value of \( f(\tau) \), and setting \( \phi = 0 \), we obtain the grand potential at \( N = \infty \) for small \( T > 0 \):

\[
\Omega(T) = E_0 - NST - \frac{1}{2} N(\gamma + 4\pi^2 E^2 K)T^2. \tag{5.66}
\]

Taking the \( T \) derivative, we obtain the leading low temperature correction to the entropy in Eq. (5.37)

\[
S(T \to 0, \mu) = N \left[ S + (\gamma + 4\pi^2 E^2 K)T \right]. \tag{5.67}
\]

As denoted above, this the entropy at a fixed chemical potential. We can use standard thermodynamic relations to compute the entropy at fixed \( Q \), using the thermodynamic relations Eqs. (5.36) and (5.65), and obtain Eq. (5.53); indeed the co-efficient of the Schwarzian was chosen so that the entropy would obey the form in Eq. (5.53). The \( T \)-dependent corrections in Eq. (5.67) and Eq. (5.53) are proportional to \( N \), and so constitute corrections from irrelevant operators which were studied.
in Section V.E, and identify the Schwarzian as representing the corrections arising from the $h = 2$ operator.

In the remainder of our discussion of the SYK model, we will evaluate the path integral in Eq. (5.58), and so obtain the finite $N$ corrections to the free energy and entropy in Eqs. (5.66) and (5.67). These results will also allow us to compute the many-particle density of states $D(E)$.

A key observation in the evaluation of Eq. (5.58) is that the path integrals factorize. To establish this, we use the boundary conditions in Eqs. (5.63) and (5.64) to parameterize

$$f(\tau) = \tau + \epsilon(\tau)$$

$$\phi(\tau) = 2\pi n T \tau + \bar{\phi}(\tau),$$

where the ‘winding number’ $n$ is an integer, and $\epsilon$ and $\bar{\phi}$ are then periodic functions of $\tau$ with period $\beta$. In the first term in the action Eq. (5.60), we can absorb $\epsilon$ by a shift in $\bar{\phi}$; then the remaining dependence on $\epsilon$ is only in the Schwarzian. In this manner, we can write Eq. (5.58) as (Gu et al., 2020)

$$\mathcal{Z} = e^{-E_a/T} Z_\mathcal{Q} Z_{\text{Sch}}$$

and we will evaluate $Z_\mathcal{Q}$ and $Z_{\text{Sch}}$ in the following subsections.

1. Rotor path integral

The partition function $Z_\mathcal{Q}$ represents fluctuations in the total charge on the SYK dot. It is expressed as a path integral over the co-ordinates of a particle moving on a unit circle (a ‘rotor’)

$$Z_\mathcal{Q} = \left( \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \exp \left[ -2\pi^2 NKT (n + i\epsilon)^2 \right] \right) \times \int \frac{D\bar{\phi}}{U(1)} \exp \left[ -\frac{NK}{2} \int_0^\beta d\tau (\dot{\phi}'(\tau))^2 \right]$$

The second term is just the imaginary time amplitude for a ‘free particle’ of mass $NK$ to return to its starting point in a time $\beta$, divided by the volume ($= 2\pi$) of the U(1) group (because a $\tau$ independent $\phi$ does not make any changes to the Green’s function in Eq. (B2)). So we obtain an expression for $Z_\mathcal{Q}$ which is useful at temperatures $T \gg 1/(NK)$.

$$Z_\mathcal{Q} = \left( \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \exp \left[ -2\pi^2 NKT (n + i\epsilon)^2 \right] \right) \sqrt{\frac{NK T}{2\pi}}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.71)

For lower temperatures, $T \ll 1/(NK)$, we can apply the Poisson summation formula to Eq. (5.71) and obtain

$$Z_\mathcal{Q} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{p=-\infty}^{\infty} \exp \left[ -\frac{p^2}{2NKT} - 2\pi \epsilon p \right].$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.72)

We note, however, that both expressions Eqs. (5.71) and (5.72) are convergent and exact at all $T$ (Gu et al., 2020).

The physical interpretation of Eq. (5.72) is especially transparent. It describes a ‘quantum dot’ with equilibrium charge $NQ$, which has fluctuations to states with charge $NQ + p$. The energy of a charge $p$ fluctuation is determined by a ‘capacitance’ $NK$, and a temperature-dependent chemical potential $-2\pi\epsilon T$. Note that the chemical potential shift is exactly that appearing in Eq. (5.59), and indeed the present analysis can be viewed as another derivation of Eq. (5.59). Recall that the key relation for the entropy in Eq. (5.59) followed after applying a Maxwell thermodynamic relation to Eq. (5.50).

The above physical interpretation also indicates that in a fixed $Q$ ensemble, we should take $Z_\mathcal{Q} = 1$. That turns out to be not quite correct, and a more careful analysis of finite $N$ corrections shows that $Z_\mathcal{Q} \sim 1/N^2$.

2. Schwarzian path integral

The other component of Eq. (5.69) is the Schwarzian path integral

$$Z_{\text{Sch}} = e^{N\mathcal{S}} \int \frac{Df(\tau)}{\text{SL}(2,R)} \exp \left[ \frac{N\gamma}{4\pi^2} \int_0^\beta d\tau \left\{ \tan(\pi T f(\tau)), \tau \right\} \right]$$

We have normalized the path integral by the (infinite) volume of the non-compact group SL(2,R) because, as we argued earlier, the action must vanish under SL(2,R) transformations. This quotient will be crucial in obtaining a well-defined answer.

It was shown (Stanford and Witten, 2017) that the path integral in Eq. (5.73) can be evaluated exactly. The key to their result is the remarkable fact that a Gaussian approximation to the path integral is in fact exact. We will exploit this by just evaluating Eq. (5.73) in the Gaussian approximation.

To this end, we expand the Schwarzian action in dimensional Fourier coefficients of $\epsilon(\tau)$ in Eq. (5.68)

$$\epsilon(\tau) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \epsilon_n e^{-2\pi in T \tau},$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.74)

and obtain

$$I_{\text{eff}}[\epsilon] = -\frac{N\gamma T}{2} + 2\pi^2 N\gamma T \sum_n n^2(n^2 - 1)\epsilon_n^2.$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.75)

Now notice that $I_{\text{eff}}[\epsilon]$ vanishes for the smallest 3 Matsubara frequencies $\omega_n = 0, \pm 2\pi T$. Indeed, the action was designed to vanish for any time reparameterization which belongs to SL(2,R), a three-dimensional non-compact space. And here we have discovered three Fourier components which cause no variation in the action to second order: clearly, we can identify the frequency components at
\( n = 0, \pm 1 \) as the infinitesimal limit of the SL(2,R) transformations. At Gaussian order, the path integral over these action-free normal modes therefore cancels against the volume of SL(2,R) in Eq. (5.73). Actually, this cancellation happens also for large SL(2,R) transformations, but that we do not prove here.

Performing the Gaussian integral over the remaining modes, we obtain for the logarithm of the partition function

\[
\ln Z_{\text{Sch}} = NS + \frac{N\gamma T}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n \neq 0, \pm 1} \ln \left[ 2\pi^2 N\gamma T n^2 (n^2 - 1) \right].
\]

(5.76)

The sum over the Matsubara frequency \( \omega_n \) is clearly divergent, and should be cutoff at a frequency \( |\omega_n| \sim U \), above which our low energy Schwarzian theory does not apply. We describe the regulation of the divergence in Appendix D: there is a contribution \( \sim U/T \), but this can be absorbed into a redefinition of \( E_0 \) in Eq. (5.69). The needed subleading term is \( \sim \ln(U/T) \), and an important result is that the co-efficient of the \( \ln(T) \) term is universal; we find for \( T \ll U \) (Kitaev and Suh, 2017; Maldacena and Stanford, 2016; Stanford and Witten, 2017)

\[
\ln Z_{\text{Sch}} = NS + \frac{N\gamma T}{2} - \frac{3}{2} \ln \left( \frac{U}{T} \right).
\]

(5.77)

Apart from the finite \( N \) corrections in the rotor components (which had a simple physical interpretation), we have now obtained our first non-trivial finite \( N \) correction to the SYK model: the \( -(3/2) \ln(1/T) \) correction to the logarithm of the partition function. Note that the logarithm in Eq. (5.77) becomes as large as the leading term only at an exponentially low \( T \sim U e^{-N} \), below which the large \( N \) theory does not apply.

It is also useful to compare Eq. (5.77) to our earlier large \( N \) result for \(-T \ln Z\) in the random matrix model in Eq. (4.16). That had a leading \( N\gamma T/2 \) term, but there was no \( T\)-independent term proportional to \( N \), as the random matrix model does not have an extensive entropy in the zero temperature limit.

The \( -(3/2) \ln(1/T) \) correction to Eq. (5.77) has important consequences for the many-body density of states, \( N_{\text{Sch}}(E) \). We define this by

\[
Z_{\text{Sch}}(T) = \int_0^\infty dE N_{\text{Sch}}(E) e^{-E/T}.
\]

(5.78)

As we have absorbed the \( \sim 1/T \) term in Eq. (5.77) into a redefinition of \( E_0 \) in Eq. (5.69), we can assume in Eq. (5.78) that \( N_{\text{Sch}}(E) \) vanishes for \( E < 0 \). It turns out to be possible to determine \( N_{\text{Sch}}(E) \) by performing the inverse Laplace transform exactly using the value in Eq. (5.77). This yields (Bagrets et al., 2017; Cotler et al., 2017; García-García and Verbaarschot, 2017; Kitaev and Suh, 2017; Stanford and Witten, 2017)

\[
N_{\text{Sch}}(E) \propto e^{NS} \sinh \left( \sqrt{2N\gamma E} \right).
\]

(5.79)

It is easier to insert the result Eq. (5.79) into Eq. (5.78), perform the \( E \) integral, and verify that we obtain Eq. (5.77).

The result Eq. (5.79) is accurate for \( E \ll NU \), and even down to \( E \sim U/N \). Near the lower bound it predicts a many-body density of states \( \sim e^{NS} \), in sharp contrast to the random matrix model of Section IV which did not have an exponentially large density of states at such low energies. We showed numerical plots of the many-body density states (Cotler et al., 2017; Fu and Sachdev, 2016; Gharibyan et al., 2018) for a closely related Majorana fermion model in Fig. 5. Notice the much larger density of states, and much smaller level spacing near the bottom of the band, in comparison to the free fermion random matrix model in Fig. 4 of the same size. This is also evident from a comparison of the Schwarzian result in Eq. (5.79), with the free fermion result in Eq. (4.18): the most important difference is the presence of the prefactor of \( e^{NS} \) in Eq. (5.79).

We now recall our discussion at the end of Section IV.B where we argued that the low-lying many-body eigenstates at excitation energies of order \( 1/N \) could be interpreted as the sums of quasiparticle energies. In the SYK model we have order \( e^{NS} \) energy levels even within energy \( \sim 1/N \) above the many-body ground states. It is impossible to construct these many-body eigenstates from order \( N \) quasiparticle states. This is therefore strong evidence that there is no quasiparticle decomposition of the many-body eigenstates of the SYK model.

Finally, we combine the results for the rotor and Schwarzian partition functions, and obtain corresponding results for the SYK model (Gu et al., 2020). Using the \( n = 0 \) term in Eqs. (5.71) and (5.77) in Eq. (5.69), we obtain for \( U/N \ll T \ll U \)

\[
\Omega = E_0 - NST - \frac{N(\gamma + 4\pi^2 E^2 K)T^2}{2} + 2T \ln \left( \frac{U}{T} \right) + \ldots.
\]

(5.80)

This contains the \( 1/N \) correction to the result Eq. (5.66) for the grand partition function: the \( 2T \ln(1/T) \) term. As for the random matrix model, we can invert Eq. (5.80) to obtain the many body density of states in the grand canonical ensemble for grand energies \( U/N \ll E \ll NU \)

\[
N(E) \sim \exp(S(E))
\]

\[
S(E) = NS + \sqrt{2N(\gamma + 4\pi^2 E^2 K)(E - E_0)}
\]

(5.81)

for \( E > E_0 \), and \( S(E) = 0 \) for \( E < E_0 \). Comparing this to the random matrix model, we find that \( S(E) \) has a similar functional form of \( E \), but without the leading \( NS \) term.

VI. RANDOM EXCHANGE QUANTUM MAGNETS

The SYK model discussed so far provides valuable insight into quantum systems without quasiparticle ex-
quantum magnets with a Hamiltonian of the form $H = \sum_{i<j} J_{ij} S_i \cdot S_j$, a pure spin model in which explicit on-site charge fluctuations are absent. In Section VII, we will introduce charge fluctuations and consider itinerant electron models, with a strong, on-site, repulsive interaction $U$. Notably, we will find substantial evidence that near critical points and/or over significant intermediate energy scales, these correlated models exhibit singular behavior which connects to the critical properties of the SYK model. Section VIII will extend the present random quantum magnet in a different manner, by adding a second band of free electrons (similar to that in Section IV), and so describe a random exchange Kondo-Heisenberg model.

Unlike the SYK model, the models mentioned above are not solvable analytically in the limit of a large number of sites $N$. We will follow two routes towards understanding their phase diagram. First, analytical results can be obtained by extending the spin symmetry from SU(2) to SU($M$) and taking the large-$M$ limit or, in the SU(2) case by using renormalization group methods in the vicinity of specific fixed points. Secondly, modern computational algorithms now provide a controlled numerical solution of such models in the SU(2) case directly, even close to quantum critical points. Some algorithms are briefly reviewed in Sec. IX.

This section applies the above approaches to random exchange quantum magnets. We consider insulating quantum magnets with a Hamiltonian of the form

$$H_J = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} J_{ij} S_i \cdot S_j,$$

where $S_i$ are quantum spin operators on site $i$, and $J_{ij}$ are independent random variables with vanishing mean and variance $J$. In the most important case, the spins belong to the SU(2) algebra, and we have $S = \frac{1}{2}$ states on each site. As noted above, we will also consider generalizations to SU($M$) spins.

Models like Eq. (6.1) with classical spins have served as the foundations of spin glass theory, and more generally of optimization problems and also of neural networks (Mezard et al., 1987). Here, we will see that such models are also a valuable starting point for understanding correlated electron systems without quasiparticle excitations.

### A. SU($M$) symmetry with $M$ large

As stated above, Eq. (6.1) is not analytically solvable for the SU(2) case, even in the limit of $N \to \infty$. We will return to the SU(2) case in Section VI.C, but here we consider the extension to SU($M$) spin symmetry, with $M$ large, that was originally examined by Sachdev and Ye (Sachdev and Ye, 1993). We will see that the limit $N \to \infty$ followed by the limit $M \to \infty$ leads to the same saddle point equations and $G$-$\Sigma$ action as the SYK model of Section V.

For the SU($M$) case, we employ the representation of spin using fermionic spinons $f_{i\alpha}$, $\alpha = 1 \ldots M$. These fermions obey the constraint

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^{M} f_{i\alpha}^\dagger f_{i\alpha} = \kappa M$$

on each site $i$, where $0 < \kappa < 1$. The SU(2) case corresponds to $M = 2$ and $\kappa = 1/2$. Then, we can write the spin operators as $S_{i\alpha \beta} = f_{i\alpha}^\dagger f_{i\beta}$, and generalize Eq. (6.1) to

$$H_J = \frac{1}{\sqrt{NM}} \sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{M} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} J_{ij} f_{i\alpha}^\dagger f_{i\beta} f_{j\alpha}^\dagger f_{j\beta}.$$

This fermionic spinon representation has fractionalized the spin operator, and carries an emergent U(1) gauge symmetry $f_{i\alpha} \to e^{i\delta_{\alpha \beta}} f_{i\alpha}$. Below we will see that, in the large $M$ limit, the $f_{i\alpha}$ form a SYK state: in the context of the random quantum magnet, this state is a critical, gapless, spin liquid. In the present large $N, M$ expansion, the Lagrange multiplier $\lambda_i$, introduced below, plays the role of an emergent gauge field in this spin liquid.

We proceed (Sachdev and Ye, 1993) with an analysis of Eq. (6.3) similar to that presented for Eq. (5.1a). We average over $J_{ij}$, and obtain the averaged partition function analogous to Eq. (5.54):

$$Z = \int \mathcal{D} f_{i\alpha}(\tau) \mathcal{D} \lambda_i(\tau) e^{-S_B - S_J}$$

$$S_B = \sum_i \int_0^\beta d\tau \left\{ f_{i\alpha}^\dagger \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} + i\lambda \right) f_{i\alpha} - i\lambda \kappa M \right\}$$

$$S_J = -\frac{J^2}{4NM} \int_0^\beta d\tau d\tau' \left| \sum_i f_{i\alpha}^\dagger(\tau) f_{i\beta}(\tau') f_{i\beta}^\dagger(\tau') f_{i\alpha}(\tau') \right|^2.$$

In the large $N$ limit, we assume self-averaging among the sites, and in the large $M$ limit, we can replace the quartic operator of fermions by the product of Green’s functions of the $f$ fermions:

$$f_{i\alpha}^\dagger(\tau) f_{i\beta}(\tau') f_{i\beta}^\dagger(\tau') f_{i\alpha}(\tau') = \delta_{\alpha \beta} \delta(\tau - \tau') G(\tau, \tau') G(\tau', \tau).$$

Then, the analysis proceeds just as for the SYK model, and we obtain an expression for the $G$-$\Sigma$ action nearly
identical to that in Eq. (5.56) but with a prefactor of $N$ replaced by $NM$:

$$I[G, \Sigma, \lambda] = -\ln \det [\{(\partial_\tau + i\lambda(\tau_1))\delta(\tau_1 - \tau_2) + \Sigma(\tau_1, \tau_2)\}]$$

$$- \text{Tr} (\Sigma \cdot G) - \frac{J^2}{4} \text{Tr} (G^2 \cdot G^2) - i\kappa \int_0^\beta d\tau \lambda(\tau) . \quad (6.6)$$

Consequently the subsequent results for the fermion Green’s function and the large $NM$ thermodynamics are identical to those in Section V after the replacement $U \rightarrow J$ and $Q \rightarrow \kappa$.

The local spin-spin correlation can also be obtained as

$$Q(\tau) = \frac{1}{M^2} \left\langle f_\alpha(\tau)f_\beta(\tau)f_\beta^\dagger(\tau')f_\alpha^\dagger(\tau') \right\rangle = \frac{C^2 e^{-2\pi\varepsilon}}{(1 + e^{-4\pi\varepsilon}) \sin(\pi T\tau)} , \quad 0 < \tau < \frac{1}{T} . \quad (6.7)$$

which has been obtained from Eq. (5.25). We can obtain the spin spectral density, $\rho_Q$, by a Fourier transform, which yields (Parcollet and Georges, 1999)

$$\rho_Q(\omega) \sim \tanh \left( \frac{\omega}{2T} \right) . \quad (6.8)$$

At $T = 0$, this corresponds to a spin density of states $\sim sgn(\omega)$, which is a starting assumption in the original theory of the marginal Fermi liquid (Varma et al., 1989).

Recent work (Tikhonovskaya et al., 2021a) has obtained corrections to the correlators of the quantum magnet $H_J$ from perturbations of the critical theory by leading irrelevant operators described in Section V.E. The most important corrections arise from the operator with scaling dimension $h = 2$, and similar to Eq. (5.44) and Eq. (5.45), we obtain

$$\rho_Q(\omega) \sim \tanh \left( \frac{\omega}{2T} \right) \left[ 1 - C\gamma \omega \tanh \left( \frac{\omega}{2T} \right) \right] , \quad (6.9)$$

where $\gamma \sim 1/J$ is the co-efficient of the Schwarzian in Eq. (5.60), and also the linear-in-$T$ coefficient of the specific heat in Eq. (5.53). The dimensionless number $C$ is universal,

$$C = \frac{24}{\pi [2\cos(2\theta) + 3\pi \cos^2(2\theta)]} . \quad (6.10)$$

Here $\theta$ is the spectral asymmetry angle which appeared in Eq. (5.3), and which is related by the Luttinger theorem in Eq. (5.21) to $K$ in Eq. (6.2). We will compare Eq. (6.9) with numerical studies of the SU(2) magnet in Section VI.B.

B. SU(2) model

We now return to the original model in Eq. (6.1), and examine it for the physically important case with SU(2) symmetry. We proceed as in the analyses of classical spin glass problems, by introducing replicas, and then average over the replicated partition function. This yields a self-consistent problem of a single quantum spin with replica indices (Bray and Moore, 1980). The replica structure is important for the spin-glass phase (Biroli and Parcollet, 2002; Georges et al., 2000, 2001), but here we will limit our consideration to a possible paramagnetic phase, or to the critical point at the onset of spin glass order. In these cases, it is permissible at large $N$ to ignore the replica indices and consider the following path integral for a single quantum spin $S = 1/2$

$$Z_J = \int \mathcal{D}S(\tau)\delta(S^2 - 1)e^{-S_B - S_J} \quad (6.11)$$

$$S_B = \frac{i}{2} \int_0^1 du \int d\tau \mathcal{S} \cdot \left( \frac{\partial \mathcal{S}}{\partial \tau} \times \frac{\partial \mathcal{S}}{\partial u} \right)$$

$$S_J = -\frac{J^2}{2} \int d\tau d\tau' Q(\tau - \tau')\mathcal{S}(\tau) \cdot \mathcal{S}(\tau') .$$

This is a coherent state path integral, and $S_B$ is the geometric Berry phase, closely connected to the spin commutation relations. The spin has a temporal self-interaction with itself, represented by the function $Q(\tau)$. The value of $Q(\tau)$ is to be determined self-consistently by computing the correlator,

$$\overline{Q}(\tau - \tau') \equiv \frac{1}{3} \langle \mathcal{S}(\tau) \cdot \mathcal{S}(\tau') \rangle_{Z_J} , \quad (6.12)$$

and then imposing the self-consistency condition,

$$Q(\tau) = \overline{Q}(\tau) . \quad (6.13)$$

Contrary to the large-$M$ limit, the SU(2) random Heisenberg model orders in a spin-glass at low temperatures. This can be established in two ways. First, the replica diagonal effective action Eq. (6.11) for the disordered averaged Green functions can be solved numerically exactly using Quantum Monte Carlo methods in the paramagnetic phase (Grempel and Rozenberg, 1998). At low temperature, the spin-glass susceptibility diverges at $T = T_{SG} \approx 0.14J$ at the boundary of the spin glass phase.

Second, exact diagonalization of finite size systems have been performed directly in the spin glass phase for many realizations ($10^4$ to $10^5$) of the quenched disorder (Arrachea and Rozenberg, 2002; Shackleton et al., 2021). The local dynamical spin susceptibility $\chi^{(\omega)}(\omega)$ was computed from both full diagonalization of small systems at finite $T$, and Lanczos method at $T = 0$. From a finite size scaling analysis, the $T = 0$ disordered averaged susceptibility in the thermodynamic limit is of the form

$$\chi''(\omega) = q_{EA} \pi \beta \omega \delta(\omega) + \chi''_{\text{reg}}(\omega) , \quad (6.14)$$

where $q_{EA} \approx 0.02$ is the Edwards-Anderson parameter (Shackleton et al., 2021) and $\chi''_{\text{reg}}(\omega)$ is the regular part. Fig. 10, presents numerical results for $\chi''_{\text{loc}}(\omega)$ for the $t$-J model for various dopings $p$; the present discussion is
for $p = 0$, and the doped cases will be discussed in Section VI.B. Apart from the delta function spin glass contribution at very low frequencies, the structure of $\chi''(\omega)$ is notable. Specifically, the theory of the gapless spin fluid phase studied in Section VI.A predicts quite generally that

$$\chi''(\omega) = C_1 \text{sgn}(\omega)[1 - C_2|\omega| + \ldots], \quad T = 0. \quad (6.15)$$

Formally, this result follows from taking the $T \to 0$ limit of the large $M$ result in Eq. (6.9). However, the structure of Eq. (6.15) is much more general: the $\text{sgn}(\omega)$ is linked to the exact SU(2) exponent we will obtain below in Eq. (6.23). And the $|\omega|$ correction term is similarly robust, and is related to the Schwarzian operator with $h = 2$, as in Eq. (5.45) (in Section XII.B, we will relate this $h = 2$ mode to the boundary graviton in the holographic dual.) As shown in Fig. 10, the form in Eq. (6.15) provides a good fit to the numerical susceptibility of the $p = 0$ SU(2) model, apart from the low frequency peak associated with spin glass order. We can therefore conclude that the spin glass order $q \approx 0.02$ is weak, and there is clear evidence of the SY spin liquid behavior at intermediate energy scales in the SU(2) random exchange quantum magnet.

A theory for the quantum spin glass state can be obtained using bosonic spinons, and the spin glass order appears when the bosonic spinons condense (Georges et al., 2000, 2001). Such a theory is applicable when $q_{EA}$ is large, and yields $\chi''(\omega) \sim \omega$ in Eq. (6.14) at small $|\omega|$ after an assumption of marginal stability in the replica symmetry breaking structure. More recently, the onset of spin glass order has been studied (Christos et al., 2021) using the fermionic spinon large $M$ theory of Section VI.A. Such a theory yields an estimate of the critical temperature to spin glass order

$$T_{sg} \sim J \exp\left(-\sqrt{M\pi}\right), \quad (6.16)$$

and also has $\chi''(\omega) \sim \omega$ for $|\omega| < \omega_\ast$. The fermionic spinon theory describes the crossover above the frequency $\omega_\ast = Jq_{EA}$ to the spin liquid spectrum in Eqs. (6.15) or (6.9). The exponential factor in Eq. (6.16) is small even for $M = 2$, $e^{-\sqrt{2\pi}} = 0.0815 \ldots$ and this could be the justification for the applicability of the large $M$ theory to the SU(2) case.

C. RG analysis of the SU(2) model

We now turn to an analytic study of the SU(2) model, as this will help us understand the structure of non-zero frequency spin susceptibility observed in the numerics, as described by Eq. (6.15).

We present here a systematic RG procedure to analyze the problem defined by Eqs. (6.11) - (6.13). We begin by assuming that there is a critical solution in which $Q(\tau)$ has a power-law decay in time. Notice that this is similar to the assumption made for the SYK model in Eq. (5.3): in that case we were able to solve the self-consistency problem exactly at low energies. That will not be possible here, and we will have to introduce an $\epsilon$-expansion defined below. We assume the power-law decay

$$Q(\tau) \sim \frac{\gamma^2}{|\tau|^{\alpha}}, \quad (6.17)$$

and postpone consideration of the self-consistency condition. Then, we have to solve the well-defined problem of computing $\tilde{Q}(\tau)$ from Eq. (6.12), given the $Q(\tau)$ in Eq. (6.17).

This problem can be reduced to the solution of a quantum impurity problem, sometimes called the Bose-Kondo problem (Sengupta, 2000). We begin by decoupling the $S(\tau) \cdot S(0)$ interaction in Eq. (6.11) with a bosonic field $\phi_\alpha, \alpha = 1 \ldots 3$. We assume that there is a bosonic ‘bath’ field that lives in $d$ spatial dimensions, $\phi_\alpha(x, \tau)$, and the decoupling field is $\phi_\alpha(x = 0, \tau)$. Then the path integral for $Z_J$ in Eq. (6.11) reduces to the solution of the following Bose-Kondo Hamiltonian of a $S = 1/2$ spin $S_n$ coupled to a bosonic scalar field $\phi_\alpha(x, \tau)$:

$$H_{\text{imp}} = \gamma S_n \phi_\alpha(0) + \frac{1}{2} \int d^d x \left[\pi_\alpha^2 + (\partial_\tau \phi_\alpha)^2\right] \quad (6.18)$$

Here $\pi_\alpha$ is canonically conjugate to the field $\phi_\alpha$, and $\phi_\alpha(0) \equiv \phi_\alpha(x = 0)$. We identify $Q(\tau)$ with temporal correlator of $\phi_\alpha(0)$, and then from Eq. (6.17) we conclude that we need $\alpha = d - 1$. 

FIG. 10 (Shackleton et al., 2021) Local spin response function for the spin-1/2 doped random exchange t-J model, as obtained by exact diagonalization of an $N = 18$ site cluster, averaged over 100 disorder realizations, for $t = J = 1$. $n = 1 - p$ is the particle density.
We now wish to determine the properties of the theory $H_{imp}$ in a renormalized perturbation expansion in the coupling $\gamma$. A simple determination of scaling dimensions at tree level shows that $\gamma$ has scaling dimension $(3-d)/2$, and so an expansion in powers of $\gamma$ is equivalent to an RG expansion in

$$\epsilon = 3 - d = 2 - \alpha.$$  

(6.19)

Such a computation can be performed (Sachdev, 2001; Sachdev et al., 1999; Sengupta, 2000; Smith and Si, 1999; Vojta et al., 2000) while imposing the fermion constraint in Eq. (6.2) for SU(2) exactly, and yields the two-loop $\beta$ function,

$$\beta(\gamma) = -\epsilon \frac{2}{\gamma} + \gamma^3 - \gamma^5 + \ldots$$  

(6.20)

This has a stable fixed point at $\gamma^2 = \epsilon/2 + \epsilon^2/4 + \ldots$ which provides the needed critical theory of $Z_J$ with the interaction in Eq. (6.17).

To solve the self-consistent theory, we need to compute $\overline{Q}(\tau)$ in Eq. (6.12) at this fixed point. The scaling dimension of the spin operator $\text{dim}[S]$ can be computed by standard RG methods order-by-order in $\epsilon$, but we encounter an unexpected simplification. Because of the quantized Berry phase (Wess-Zumino-Witten) term, the renormalization of the coupling $\gamma$ is given only by the wavefunction renormalization, and this fixes the scaling dimension of the spin-operator at the non-trivial fixed point of the $\beta$ function: we find (Sachdev, 2001; Vojta et al., 2000)

$$\text{dim}[S] = \epsilon/2,$$  

(6.21)

exact to all orders in $\epsilon$. This implies the correlator

$$\overline{Q}(\tau) = \frac{1}{3} \langle S(\tau) \cdot S(0) \rangle \sim \frac{1}{|\tau|^{2-\alpha}}.$$  

(6.22)

Finally, we impose the self-consistency condition in Eq. (6.13) at least at the level of the exponent. Comparing Eqs. (6.17) and (6.22), we conclude that the self-consistent value is $\alpha = 1$. Note that this value is well outside the domain of applicability of the $\epsilon$ expansion, given Eq. (6.19). Nevertheless, given that Eq. (6.21) has been obtained to all orders in $\epsilon$, we can be confident of the result: it only requires the continued existence of the non-trivial fixed point of the $\beta$ function at $\epsilon$ of order unity. The self-consistent spin correlator is therefore

$$\langle S(\tau) \cdot S(0) \rangle \sim \frac{1}{|\tau|}.$$  

(6.23)

Comparing with the large $M$ result in Eq. (6.7), we find perfect agreement between the large $M$ and RG exponents.

As discussed in Section VI.B, the ground state of Eq. (6.1) is actually a spin glass for SU(2) spins. The above analysis obtaining the result in Eq. (6.22) is certainly correct for SU(2), and applies exactly to the Bose-Kondo impurity model defined by Eq. (6.18). The difficulty arises in the transition to the SY model, where we also need to impose the self-consistency condition in Eq. (6.13). We have only imposed the self-consistency at the level of the leading exponent for the long-time decay, but the self-consistency has to be imposed to the coefficient of the long-time decay, and also at earlier times. The numerical analysis shows that there is no critical solution of the type in Eq. (6.23) for SU(2) under this more stringent self-consistency.

Despite the direct inapplicability of the RG to the SU(2) model in Eq. (6.1), the analysis presented here turns out to be very useful. A closely related RG applies to the SU($M$) generalization considered in Section VI.A (Joshi et al., 2020), and from this we can conclude that there are no corrections to the exponent in Eq. (6.21) (which is related to the exponent in Eq. (6.7)) at all orders in $1/M$. Moreover extensions of the RG of the Bose-Kondo model obtained here will apply to the correlated electrons models to be considered in the following sections: to the superspin Bose-Fermi-Kondo model in Section VII.D.3, and the Bose-Fermi-Kondo model in Section VIII.D.

VII. RANDOM EXCHANGE $t$-$U$-$J$ HUBBARD MODELS

In the following, we will consider models of itinerant electrons on a fully connected lattice with a strong local interaction and random exchange constants. One such example is the ‘$t$-$U$-$J$’ model in which random $J_{ij}$’s are added to the Hubbard model with random hoppings:

$$H_{tUJ} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{M} t_{ij} c_{i\alpha}^\dagger c_{j\alpha} - \mu \sum_{\alpha} c_{i\alpha}^\dagger c_{i\alpha} - \frac{U}{2} \sum_{i} \left( \sum_{\alpha} c_{i\alpha}^\dagger c_{i\alpha} - M/2 \right)^2 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} J_{ij} S_i \cdot S_j.$$  

(7.1)

In this expression, we have introduced $M$ ‘colors’ of fermions, so that the model has $U(M) = U(1) \times SU(M)$ symmetry, corresponding to an extension of the spin symmetry to SU($M$). The usual SU(2), $S = 1/2$ Hubbard model corresponds to $M = 2$ ($\alpha = \uparrow, \downarrow$). The electron spin operators, $S_i = \sum_{\alpha} \sigma_{i\alpha}^\dagger c_{i\alpha}, \sigma_{i\alpha}$ with $\sigma$ the $2 \times 2$ generators of SU($M$) ($\sigma$ are the Pauli matrices for $M = 2$). As before, the $t_{ij}$’s and $J_{ij}$’s are drawn from distributions with zero mean and variances $\overline{t_{ij}^2} = t^2$, $\overline{J_{ij}^2} = J^2$; however, as we will note below, closely related results also apply to the case where the $t_{ij}$ are non-random, and determine an electronic dispersion $\epsilon_k$. Note a change in notation from the SYK model above: $U$ designates here the on-site repulsion while the variance $J$
of the random bonds is more directly analogous to the variance of the random SYK interactions. Also note that the chemical potential μ is defined with reference to the half-filled case (M/2 electrons per site).

We can also consider the t-J limit of this model (Parcollet and Georges, 1999), which reads:

\[
H_{tJ} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} \sum_{\alpha} t_{ij} P c_{i\alpha}^\dagger c_{j\alpha} P - \mu \sum_{i\alpha} c_{i\alpha}^\dagger c_{i\alpha}
+ \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} J_{ij} S_i \cdot S_j \tag{7.2}
\]

in which the operator P enforces a Gutzwiller-type projection such that the total number of fermions on each site is at most M/2:

\[
\sum_{\alpha} c_{i\alpha}^\dagger c_{i\alpha} \leq \frac{M}{2}, \forall i. \tag{7.3}
\]

At half-filling (μ = 0) this reduces to the random-bond Heisenberg (SY) model of the previous section.

A. Effective local action

In the thermodynamic limit \( N \to \infty \), the calculation of the single-particle Green’s function and self-energy of this model, as well as that of the local spin-spin correlator, reduces to a local effective action subject to a self-consistency condition. This corresponds to the (extended) dynamical mean-field theory construction (EDMFT) (Chitra and Kotliar, 2000; Georges et al., 1996; Sengupta and Georges, 1995; Si and Smith, 1996; Smith and Si, 2000), which is exact for these random fully-connected models. The term ‘extended’ is commonly used to indicate that the mapping involves a self-consistency over both single-particle and two-particle correlation functions. When considering the system outside the spin-glass phase, all local correlators are self-averaging and this mapping is most easily derived following the cavity construction, similar to Sec. IV. We skip the details here, since the reasoning is completely analogous to the one in that section. One obtains the single-site effective action:

\[
\Sigma_{iiJ} = \int d\tau \sum_{\alpha} c_{i\alpha}^\dagger(\tau) \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} - \mu \right) c_{i\alpha}(\tau)
+ \frac{U}{2} \int d\tau \left( \sum_{\alpha} c_{i\alpha}^\dagger c_{i\alpha} - M/2 \right)^2
+ \int d\tau d\tau' \Delta(\tau - \tau') \sum_{\alpha} c_{i\alpha}^\dagger(\tau') c_{i\alpha}(\tau')
- \frac{1}{2} \int d\tau d\tau' J(\tau - \tau') S(\tau) \cdot S(\tau'). \tag{7.4}
\]

From this action we have to determine the Green’s function and spin correlator:

\[
G(\tau - \tau') = -\frac{1}{M} \sum_{\alpha} \langle c_{i\alpha}(\tau) c_{i\alpha}^\dagger(\tau') \rangle_{\Sigma_{iiJ}}
\]

\[
\chi(\tau - \tau') = \frac{1}{M^2 - 1} \langle \mathbf{S}(\tau) \cdot \mathbf{S}(\tau') \rangle_{\Sigma_{iiJ}}, \tag{7.5}
\]

and impose the self-consistency condition that results from the cavity construction:

\[
\Delta(\tau) = t^2 G(\tau), \quad J(\tau) = J^2 \chi(\tau). \tag{7.6}
\]

The electronic self-energy can be defined by reference to the non-interacting system \( U = J = 0 \) (the random matrix model of Sec. IV) as \( G_{ij}^{-1}(i\omega_n) = i\omega_n + \mu - t_{ij} - \Sigma_{ij} \), for a given sample \( \{t_{ij}\} \). In the infinite-volume limit \( N \to \infty \), the self-energy becomes local \( \Sigma_{ij} = \Sigma_{ii} \delta_{ij} \) and self-averaging, when not in the spin-glass phase. The local Green’s function \( G_{ii} \) is also self-averaging and is related to \( \Sigma \) by:

\[
G_{ii}(i\omega_n) = \sum_{\lambda} |(i\lambda)|^2 G(i\omega_n, \varepsilon_{\lambda})
\to \int \rho_0(\varepsilon) G(i\omega_n, \varepsilon) = G(i\omega_n), \tag{7.7}
\]

with \( \rho_0 \) the semi-circular density of states defined in Sec. IV and

\[
G(i\omega_n, \varepsilon) = \frac{1}{i\omega_n + \mu - \varepsilon - \Sigma(i\omega_n)} \tag{7.8}
\]

is the Green’s function in the basis of the single-particle states of the free system at an energy \( \varepsilon \). The self-energy \( \Sigma \) coincides with that of the effective action Eq. (7.4) and hence reads:

\[
\Sigma(i\omega_n) = i\omega_n + \mu - t^2 \Delta(i\omega_n) - G^{-1}(i\omega_n). \tag{7.9}
\]

Substituting this expression into Eq. (7.8) and performing the Hilbert transform of \( \rho_0 \), one recovers the self-consistency condition \( \Delta = t^2 G \) (Georges et al., 1996).

When a spin-glass phase exists, self-averaging of the local observables does not hold inside the ordered phase. A mapping onto a local effective action still applies however after introducing \( n \) replicas and performing the average of \( \langle Z^n - 1 \rangle/n \) over the \( t_{ij} \) and \( J_{ij} \) random variables, after which the \( n \to 0 \) limit must be taken also allowing for the possibility of replica symmetry breaking. We do not write these equations in detail here, and refer the reader to Refs. (Georges et al., 2000, 2001).

In order to make contact with the (E)DMFT literature, we have used in this section notations that are rather standard in this field. In particular \( \Delta(\tau) \) is the dynamical mean-field (quantum generalization of the Weiss field), describing the hybridisation between a local site and its self-consistent bath. In the following, we will often use somewhat different notations which are more commonly
used in the SY/SYK literature, such as $\Delta \to t^2 R$, $G \to R$, $J \to J^2 Q$ and $\chi \to Q$.

We also note that the single-site effective action permits a spin glass phase after we include replica off-diagonal components of the correlators (Georges et al., 2000, 2001). In the replica diagonal components $J(\tau \to \infty) \neq 0$ at zero temperature. Naively, such a non-zero limit signals a problem in the replica diagonal action in Eq. (7.4), as the expectation value of the last term in the action diverges as $\sim \beta^2$ as $\beta \to \infty$, implying a divergent ground state energy. However, this problem is cured upon including the replica off-diagonal components and taking the replica $n \to 0$ limit (Read et al., 1995). This issue highlights the difficulty in interpreting the EDMFT framework in the magnetically ordered phase for non-random systems (Kirchner et al., 2020; Pankov et al., 2002; Si et al., 2001, 2003).

B. The SU(2) Hubbard model at half-filling

The SU(2) $t$-$U$-$J$ model in Eq. (7.1) was studied at half-filling in the EDMFT framework (Cha et al., 2020b) — for a previous study in the large-$M$ limit, see (Florens et al., 2013). The phase diagram is reproduced in Fig. 11 as a function of $t/U$ and temperature, as obtained by a quantum Monte Carlo solution of the EDMFT equations (cf Section IX). A quantum critical point (QCP) at $U = U_c$ separates a Fermi liquid phase at small $U$ from an insulator at large $U$, which orders into a spin glass phase at low temperature. At the quantum critical point, the spin correlations decays as $\chi(\tau) \sim 1/\tau$, as in the large-$M$ limit of the SY model, while it is the expected $\chi(\tau) \sim 1/\tau^2$ in the Fermi liquid phase.

The electronic self-energy $\Sigma$ is strongly affected by the QCP. While it takes its regular form in the Fermi liquid, the coherence temperature vanishes at the QCP, where a linear temperature behaviour $\text{Im} \Sigma(\omega = 0, T) \propto T$ is found numerically. As detailed below in Sec. VII.E, this behaviour leads at the QCP to a $T$-linear dependence of the resistivity, which is smaller than the MIR value. Furthermore, in the accessible range of temperatures, the frequency dependence of the self-energy is compatible with a Marginal Fermi liquid form. Finally, we note a theoretical study (Tarnopolsky et al., 2020) analyzing the metal-insulator transition at half-filling, related to the finite doping theoretical models that are described in Section VII.D.

C. The SU(2) Hubbard model away from half-filling

Section VII.B has shown that the Hubbard model exhibits a novel phase transition at half-filling: between a Fermi liquid at small $U/t$, and a metallic spin glass at large $U/t$. Next we turn to the case with hole-doping $p$ away from half-filling. Here, we assume throughout that $U/t$ is large, so that at $p = 0$ we obtain the insulating spin glass phase which was described in Section VI.B. We will present numerical studies here (Dumitrescu et al., 2021; Otsuki and Vollhardt, 2013; Shackleton et al., 2021) showing that the spin glass order survives in a metallic state up to a critical doping $p = p_c$, and that there is a Fermi liquid for $p > p_c$. The critical point at $p = p_c$ displays a SYK-like criticality, with some similarities to the $U = U_c$ critical point at $p = 0$ described in Section VII.B. Analytic analyses of the $p > 0$ Hubbard model appear next in Section VII.D.

A recent study (Shackleton et al., 2021) approached the large $U$ and $p \geq 0$ Hubbard model in the $t$-$J$ model framework by performing exact diagonalizations of fully connected clusters of $N$ sites, up to $N = 18$, for a fixed sample of random hopping amplitudes and exchange constants, then taking averages or histograms over samples. This study confirms the existence of a spin-glass phase at low doping, which survives up to $p_c \simeq 0.3$ (in agreement with earlier analytic arguments (Joshi et al., 2020), to be presented in Sections VII.D.2 and VII.D.3). Their result for the local spin response function $\chi''(\omega)$ was displayed in Fig. 10. The spin-glass phase is signalled by a sharp low frequency peak in $\chi''(\omega)$, which is absent for $p > p_c$, and the spin-fluctuation spectrum close to the critical point is seen to be well approximated by the large-$M$ SYK theory of Section VI.A. These authors also com-
computed thermodynamic properties (entropy, specific heat and entanglement entropy) as a function of temperature and found that the specific heat coefficient $\gamma = C/T$ displays a maximum as a function of doping for $p \simeq p_c$.

A different and complementary approach (Otsuki and Vollhardt, 2013) was used recently (Dumitrescu et al., 2021). The EDMFT equations of Section VII.D were solved using the Quantum Monte Carlo algorithms reviewed in Section IX, corresponding to a direct solution in the thermodynamic limit $N = \infty$ for disorder-averaged observables. The model considered (Dumitrescu et al., 2021) is actually a finite-$U$ random exchange model, with $U/t$ large enough so that the physics of a doped Mott insulating spin-glass is being captured. The phase diagram obtained in this study is displayed on Fig. 12. The spin-glass phase itself (relying replica off-diagonal terms) was not studied in this work, but the location of the critical boundary in the $T$-$U$ plane was identified from the criterion $J_{\chi_{\text{loc}}} = 1$. The $T = 0$ critical doping was found to be at $p_c \simeq 0.17$ for the finite value of $U/t$ studied, in contrast to the higher value $p_c \simeq 0.3$ for the $U = \infty$ model. Consistently with the exact diagonalization study (Shackleton et al., 2021), the local spin dynamics at the critical point is of SYK type with $\chi(\tau) \propto 1/\tau$. The self-energy obeys interesting scaling properties near the critical point: the imaginary-time data for different temperatures can be collapsed onto:

$$\frac{\Sigma(\tau)}{\Sigma(\beta/2)} = \frac{c^{2\pi \varepsilon(\tau/\beta - 1/2)}}{(\sin \pi \tau/\beta)^{\nu}}$$

(7.10)

corresponding to the conformally invariant scaling form for the real-frequency scattering rate:

$$-\frac{i}{2} \text{Im} \Sigma(\omega + i0^+) = \lambda T^\nu \Phi_{\nu, \varepsilon}(\frac{\pi}{\beta}) ,$$

(7.11)

$$\Phi_{\nu, \varepsilon}(x) = \cosh \frac{x}{2} \left| \Gamma \left[ 1 + i \nu x + i \frac{\pi}{\beta} + i \varepsilon \right] \right|^2 .$$

The exponent $\nu$ at criticality was estimated to be in the range $\nu \simeq 0.6 - 0.8$. Note that a value of $\nu$ smaller than unity implies that the lifetime of single-electron excitations (inverse width of the spectral function) satisfies Planckian $T$-linear behaviour:

$$\frac{1}{\tau} \equiv -Z \text{Im} \Sigma(i0^+) = c \frac{h}{k_B T}$$

(7.12)

since, as detailed below in Sec. VII.E, $Z = (1 - \partial \text{Re} \Sigma(\omega)/\partial \omega)_{\omega = 0}^{-1}$ vanishes as $Z \propto \lambda T^{1-\nu}$ at low-$T$. The overall coupling constant $\lambda$ cancels in the expression of $\tau^*$ to dominant order, hence the prefactor $c$ is generically of order unity. This quantity is displayed on Fig. 13. The spectral asymmetry $\varepsilon$ was found to be non-zero but temperature-dependent over some extended range of $T$. Whether there is an intrinsic particle-hole asymmetry of the scaling function at criticality down to $T = 0$ is an open question.
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**FIG. 12** Phase diagram (Dumitrescu et al., 2021) of the spin-1/2 doped random exchange $t$-$U$-$J$ model, as obtained by a quantum Monte Carlo solution of the EDMFT equations. FL indicates Fermi liquid, while SG is a metallic spin glass. The resistivity $\Delta = 1$ is found. A linear-in-$T$ resistivity is obtained in the quantum-critical region with a resistivity which becomes lower than the MIR resistivity. (Inset) Zoom close to the quantum critical point.

The metallic state is a Fermi liquid for $p > p_c$, satisfying Luttinger theorem with a large Fermi energy associated with a fermion density of $1-p$, see Section VIII.C for a discussion of the Luttinger theorem in disordered systems; for the present system, it is expressed by the relation $\mu - \text{Re} \Sigma(0) = \varepsilon_F$ at $T = 0$, with $\varepsilon_F$ the Fermi energy of the non-interacting system (random matrix model) for a density $n = 1-p$. When solving the EDMFT equations without allowing for spin-glass ordering, a sudden breakdown of this relation is found for $p < p_c$ (Dumitrescu et al., 2021; Otsuki and Vollhardt, 2013), signalling a breakdown of the Luttinger theorem. These solutions correspond to a metastable state with unquenched local magnetic moments. These local moments order into a spin-glass phase, which is the actual stable phase. The finite size exact diagonalisation results (Shackleton et al., 2021) suggest that the Fermi energy may collapse to a small one of volume $p$ in this metallic spin-glass phase. This fascinating possibility awaits confirmation from an infinite-volume solution of the EDMFT equations inside the spin-glass phase.

**D. Doped $t$-$J$ model: analytical insights**

We now extend the analytic considerations of Sections VI.A and VI.C from the undoped quantum magnet at $p = 0$ to the non-zero doping $t$-$J$ model with $p \neq 0$. This will provide insight to the numerical results presented in Section VII.C for the doped Hubbard model. This analysis will be carried out in the $U \rightarrow \infty$ limit,
employing the t-J model in Eq. (7.2).

In the SU(2) (M = 2) case, the Hilbert space of the tJ model on each site consists of 3 states

\[ |0\rangle, \quad c_\uparrow^\dagger |0\rangle, \quad c_\downarrow^\dagger |0\rangle. \]

(7.13)

We will treat these 3 states in close analogy to the 2 spin states of the random magnet in Eq. (6.1) (Fritz and Vojta, 2004; Vojta and Fritz, 2004). Apart from the increase in the number of states, a crucial difference is the Fermi statistics of the electron operator, which requires that the 3 states are components of a ‘superspin’. However, there remains a choice on whether the spinful or spinless component of the superspin is fermionic. In an exact treatment of the problem, either choice is permitted and should lead to equivalent results; but in approximate treatments, one or the other choice may be superior, and it is often useful to exploit this freedom. For now, we will present our discussion by representing the superspin by a spinless boson \( b \) (the holon) and a spinful fermion \( f_\alpha \) (the spinon):

\[ |0\rangle \Rightarrow b^\dagger |v\rangle, \quad c_\uparrow^\dagger |0\rangle \Rightarrow f_\alpha^\dagger |v\rangle. \]

(7.14)

The physical states are obtained when the constraint

\[ f_\alpha^\dagger f_\alpha + b^\dagger b = 1 \]

(7.15)

is obeyed. Hence, the physical states are invariant under the U(1) gauge transformation which generalizes that in Section VI.A \( f_\alpha \rightarrow f_\alpha e^{i\phi}, \ b \rightarrow be^{i\phi} \), while individual spinon and holon excitations carry U(1) gauge charges. At the moment, the fractionalized representation, and associated emergent gauge symmetry, is just a convenient exact description of the Hilbert space. But we will see later in Sections VII.D.2 and VII.D.3 that the fractionalized operators yield a simple way to understand the exponents at a non-Fermi liquid critical point as a realization of a critical doped spin liquid.

The physical electron (\( c_\alpha \)) and spin (\( S \)) operators can be viewed as rotation operators of the superspin:

\[ c_\alpha = b^\dagger f_\alpha, \quad S = \frac{1}{2} f_\alpha^\dagger \sigma_{\alpha\beta} f_\beta. \]

(7.16)

If we combine these operators with an operator \( V \) which measures the electron density

\[ V = b^\dagger b + \frac{1}{2} f_\alpha^\dagger f_\alpha \]

\[ = 1 - \frac{1}{2} c_\alpha^\dagger c_\alpha, \]

(7.17)

we obtain all the generators of the supergroup SU(1|2). The notation indicates that this group acts on a superspin with 1 bosonic component, \( b^\dagger |v\rangle \), and 2 fermionic components, \( f_\alpha^\dagger |v\rangle \). These generators realize the superalgebra SU(1|2), which is

\[ [S^a, S^b] = i\epsilon_{abc} S^c \]

(7.18a)

\[ \{c_\alpha, c_\beta\} = 0 \]

(7.18b)

\[ \{c_\alpha, c_\beta^\dagger\} = \delta_{\alpha\beta} V + \sigma_{\alpha\beta} S^c \]

(7.18c)

\[ [S^a, c_\alpha] = -\frac{1}{2} \sigma^a_{\alpha\beta} c_\beta \]

(7.18d)

\[ [S^a, V] = 0 \]

(7.18e)

\[ [V, c_\alpha] = \frac{1}{2} c_\alpha \]

(7.18f)

If we had made the opposite choice of using spinful bosonic spinons and spinless fermionic holons, we would have obtained the superalgebra SU(2|1), which is isomorphic to SU(1|2).

The effective local action associated with this model along the lines of Sec. VI.A can be viewed as that of a single SU(1|2) superspin, in complete analogy with Eqs. (6.11)-(6.13) for the self-consistent dynamics of a single SU(2) spin. The local effective action can be written in terms of the spinon and holon fields as:

\[ Z_{tJ} = \int Df_\alpha(\tau)Db(\tau)D\lambda(\tau)e^{-S_B - S_{tJ}} \]

(7.19)

\[ S_B = \int d\tau \left[ f_\alpha^\dagger(\tau) \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} + i\lambda \right) f_\alpha(\tau) \right. \]

\[ + b^\dagger(\tau) \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} + i\lambda \right) b(\tau) - i\lambda \]

\[ S_{tJ} = s_0 \int d\tau f_\alpha^\dagger f_\alpha - \frac{J^2}{2} \int d\tau d\tau' Q(\tau - \tau') S(\tau) \cdot S(\tau') \]

\[ - t^2 \int d\tau d\tau' R(\tau - \tau') f_\alpha^\dagger(\tau)b(\tau)b(\tau')f_\alpha(\tau') + H.c. \]

The action \( S_B \) is the Berry phase of a SU(1|2) superspin, which we have expressed as the path integral over canonical bosonic and fermionic fields while imposing the
constraint Eq. (7.15) with the field $\lambda(\tau)$. The chemical potential $\mu$ of the $t$-$J$ Hamiltonian is now represented by the coupling $s_0$. From this action we have to determine the correlators
\[
\mathcal{R}(\tau - \tau') = -\frac{1}{2} \langle c_{i\alpha}(\tau)c_{i\alpha}^\dagger(\tau') \rangle_{Z_1}, \\
\mathcal{Q}(\tau - \tau') = \frac{1}{3} \langle \mathbf{S}(\tau) \cdot \mathbf{S}(\tau') \rangle_{Z_1} \tag{7.20}
\]
 analogous to Eq. (6.12). And then we impose the self-consistency conditions in Eqs. (7.5) and (7.6), which take the form
\[
\mathcal{R}(\tau) = \mathcal{R}(\tau), \quad \mathcal{Q}(\tau) = \mathcal{Q}(\tau), \tag{7.21}
\]
 analogous to Eq. (6.13).

It is not possible to solve the self-consistent single-site quantum problem defined by Eqs. (7.19)-(7.21) exactly. The following subsections will describe various theoretical expansions and numerical results, analogous to those discussed in Section VI for the random quantum magnet.

1. SU($M$) symmetry: Fermi liquid large-$M$ limit

A first approach (Parcollet and Georges, 1999) is to extend the SU($M$) large $M$ model of Section VI.A by using fermionic spinons $f_\alpha$ with an index $\alpha = 1\ldots M$, while the bosonic holons $b$ have no index. In this case, the constraints Eqs. (6.2) and (7.15) become
\[
\sum_{\alpha=1}^M f_{i\alpha}^\dagger f_{i\alpha} + b_i^\dagger b_i = \frac{M}{2} \tag{7.22}
\]
on each site $i$; we are restricting to the case with self-conjugate representations of SU($M$) at half-filling, with $\kappa = 1/2$. We also fix the doping density $p$ by
\[
\frac{1}{N} \sum_i b_i^\dagger b_i = \frac{Mp}{2}. \tag{7.23}
\]

This particular large $M$ limit is similar to that employed for non-random $t$-$J$ models (Kotliar, 1995; Lee et al., 2006), and has the crucial feature that the bosonic holons are strongly condensed at $T = 0$. Indeed, in the large $M$ limit, we may replace the boson by a number $b_i = \sqrt{Mp}$ obtained from the constraint in Eq. (7.23). Then the fermions $f_{i\alpha}$ have the same quantum numbers as an electron, with spin $S = 1/2$ and charge $-1$. The effective theory of these electrons is a sum of the random matrix Hamiltonian $H_2$ in Eq. (4.1a), and the SYK Hamiltonian $H_4$ in Eq. (5.1a). We will discuss very similar Hamiltonians in a different context in Section X and defer a complete discussion until then.

For now, we note a few important features of this large $M$ limit. The phase diagram (Parcollet and Georges, 1999) is displayed on Fig. 14. At $p = 0$, we have the SYK spin liquid state described in Section VI. At any non-zero $p$, because of the condensation of the holons $b$, we obtain a disordered Fermi liquid ground state, with quasiparticles moving with an effective hopping $t_p$. These quasiparticles are present at a large Fermi energy below which there are states of $(1 - p)/2$ electrons per spin. There is a characteristic doping $p^* \sim J/t$ which separates two different regimes with a distinct doping-dependence of the effective mass enhancement and spectral weight $Z$ of these quasiparticles. For $p > p^*$, the usual Brinkman-Rice (Brinkman and Rice, 1970) behaviour $m^*/m = 1/Z \propto 1/p$ is recovered, as in the absence of random exchange couplings. In contrast for $p < p^*$, much heavier quasiparticles are found with $m^*/m = 1/Z \propto (p^*/p)^2$. Correspondingly, the Fermi liquid coherence scale is $T_{coh} \sim (pt)^2/J$ in this regime. Hence, the random exchanges strongly modify the usual Brinkman-Rice behaviour of the doped Mott insulator at low doping. For $p < p^*$, there is an interesting crossover at $T \gtrsim T_{coh}$, above which non-Fermi liquid behaviour with spin-liquid local correlations of the SYK type are recovered (Fig. 14). This regime corresponds to a 'bad metal' with a resistivity larger than the MIR limit and, interestingly, depending linearly on temperature; see Section VII.E for a discussion of related models for which we define a proper notion of transport. The mechanism for this $T$-linear dependence is unusual. Indeed, in this regime the single particle scattering rate has the $\Im \Sigma \propto \sqrt{\omega \sqrt{T}}$ dependence of the spinon self-energy characteristic of the SYK regime. Despite this, the resistivity is found to be linear in $T$, because the dispersion of the quasiparticles is negligible as compared to this large scattering rate, so that the conductivity as obtained from the Kubo formula is proportional to $1/(\Im \Sigma \Sigma) \propto 1/T$.

These conclusions can be drawn by examining the large-$M$ equation for the spinon Green’s function $G_f$, which read (Parcollet and Georges, 1999):
\[
G_f^{-1} = i\omega_n + \mu - \lambda - (pt)^2G_f - \Sigma_f(i\omega_n) \tag{7.24}
\]
where $i\lambda = \lambda$ at the saddle point, and $\Sigma_f(\tau) = -J^2G_f^2(\tau)G_f(\tau)$ as in the large-$M$ SY model. It is easy to see that the doping-induced term $(pt)^2G_f$ is a singular perturbation that cuts-off the SYK behaviour. Indeed, substituting $\Sigma_f \propto \sqrt{J}\omega$ in the equation above, corresponding to $G_f \propto 1/\sqrt{J}\omega$, we see that a stable solution of this type can only exist for $(pt)^2/\sqrt{J}\omega \lesssim \sqrt{J}\omega$ which yields $\omega \gtrsim (pt)^2/J \sim T_{coh}$, corresponding to the crossover regime described above. For $T, \omega \lesssim T_{coh}$, the consistent solution of (7.24) is a Fermi liquid.

2. SU($M$) symmetry: non-Fermi liquid large-$M$ limit

We know from the numerical studies of the random quantum magnet discussed in Section VI.B that the actual ground state of the undoped model, $p = 0$, is a...
spin glass, in contrast to the spin liquid appearing in Section VII.D.1. It is reasonable to expect that this spin glass state survives for a range of non-zero \( p \), and this has been confirmed by numerical studies discussed in Section VII.C. We do expect a disordered Fermi liquid to appear at a sufficiently large \( p \), and then the simplest scenario is of a quantum phase transition from a spin glass to a disordered Fermi liquid at a non-zero critical \( p = p_c \). Numerical results for the SU(2) model with a transition at non-zero \( p_c \) were described in Section VII.C. The large \( M \) theory of Section VII.D.1 yields \( p_c = 0 \), and here we discuss alternative large \( M \) approaches which can realize a \( p_c > 0 \).

The relationship between the various large \( M \) limits is clarified in the schematic phase diagram shown in Fig. 15 (Joshi et al., 2020), which also incorporates the results of the SU(2) RG of Section VII.D.3.

At large \( p \) we have a disordered Fermi liquid with a large Fermi energy, which can be obtained by condensing bosonic holons \( b \). This phase is adequately described by the large \( M \) theory reviewed in Section VII.D.1, which can be viewed as a theory of SU(1/\( M \)) superspin.

The insulating spin glass phase at \( p = 0 \) has been described in a theory of bosonic spinons \( b_\alpha \), by condensing the \( b_\alpha \) (Georges et al., 2000, 2001). This can be extended to a metallic spin glass phase at small non-zero \( p \) using fermionic holons \( f \), although this has not been presented in the literature. Such a theory can be viewed as a large \( M \) theory of a SU(1/\( M \)) superspin.

Here, we shall describe a large \( M \) theory of a SU(\( M' \)/\( M \)) superspin, in which large \( M \) and \( M' \) limit is taken with \( k = M'/M \) fixed (Joshi et al., 2020; Tikhanovskaya et al., 2021b). This requires a theory of fermionic spinons \( f_\alpha, \alpha = 1 \ldots M \), just as in Section VII.D.1. However, the bosonic holons \( b_\ell \) now have an additional ‘orbital’ index \( \ell = 1 \ldots M' \). When the bosonic holons condense, as in Section VII.D.1, we obtain a disordered Fermi liquid, which is also a possible phase of this large \( M \) limit. We shall not study this phase here, and instead focus on another saddle-point of this large \( M \) limit, which has no condensation and instead exhibits SYK criticality. As indicated in Fig. 15, this critical saddle point serves as a theory of a critical point or phase between the disordered Fermi liquid and metallic spin glass phases, and realizes a doped extension of the critical spin liquid that we discussed in Section VI.A. We note that there is also an alternative large \( M \) limit of SU(\( M'/M' \)) superspin, with very similar properties (Tikhanovskaya et al., 2021b), but we will not discuss that here.

In the large \( M \) theory with a SU(\( M'/M' \)) superspin, we have electrons \( c_{\ell\alpha} \) with an additional orbital index \( \ell \); these are related to the spinons \( f_\alpha \) and holons \( b_\ell \) by

\[
c_{\ell\alpha} = f_\alpha b_\ell^\dagger \sum_{\alpha=1}^{M} f_\alpha^\dagger f_\alpha + \sum_{\ell=1}^{M'} b_\ell^\dagger b_\ell = \frac{M}{2}. \tag{7.25}
\]

The doping density \( p \) is given by

\[
\frac{1}{N} \sum_{it} b_{\ell t}^\dagger b_{it} = M' p \tag{7.26}
\]

The physical case corresponds to \( M = 2, M' = 1 \), and \( k = 1/2 \).

We can now take the large \( M \) limit in a manner which closely parallels Section VI. Then we obtain SYK-like
equations for the boson and fermion Green’s functions, now describing a critical doped spin liquid:

\[ G_b(i\omega_n) = \frac{1}{i\omega_n + \mu_b - \Sigma_b(i\omega_n)} \]
\[ \Sigma_b(\tau) = -t^2 G_f(\tau) G_f(-\tau) G_b(\tau) \]
\[ G_f(i\omega_n) = \frac{1}{i\omega_n + \mu_f - \Sigma_f(i\omega_n)} \]
\[ \Sigma_f(\tau) = -J^2 G_f^2(\tau) G_f(-\tau) + k t^2 G_f(\tau) G_b(\tau) G_b(-\tau). \] (7.27)

These equations share some similarities with the ones introduced in a study (Haule et al., 2002) of the non-random \( t-J \) model using the non-crossing approximation in the EDMFT framework. They can be obtained from a \( G-S \) action which generalizes those in Eqs. (5.56), (6.6), and (8.8)

\[ I[G, \Sigma] = -\ln \det \left[ (\partial_x - \mu_f) \delta(\tau_1 - \tau_2) + \Sigma_f(\tau_1, \tau_2) \right] + k \ln \det \left[ (\partial_x - \mu_f) \delta(\tau_1 - \tau_2) + \Sigma_b(\tau_1, \tau_2) \right] + k \text{Tr} (\Sigma_b \cdot G_b) + k \frac{t^2}{2} \text{Tr} ([G_f G_b] \cdot [G_f G_b]) - \text{Tr} (\Sigma_f \cdot G_f) - \frac{J^2}{2} \text{Tr} (G_f^2 \cdot G_b^2). \] (7.28)

Here \( \mu_f \) and \( \mu_b \) are chemical potentials chosen to satisfy

\[ \langle f^\dagger f \rangle = \frac{1}{2} - k \rho, \quad \langle b^\dagger b \rangle = p. \] (7.29)

Numerical analysis has confirmed (Tikhonovskaya et al., 2021b) that Eq. (7.27) has critical solutions with the following low energy behavior

\[ G_f(z) = C_f e^{-i(\pi \Delta_f + \theta_f)/z} \] \quad \text{Im}(z) > 0 \]
\[ G_b(z) = C_b e^{-i(\pi \Delta_b + \theta_b)/z} \] \quad \text{Im}(z) > 0 \]
\[ \Delta_f + \Delta_b = \frac{1}{2} \]
\[ \frac{\theta_f}{\pi} + \left( \frac{1}{2} - \Delta_f \right) \frac{\sin(2\theta_f)}{\sin(2\pi \Delta_f)} = k \rho \]
\[ \frac{\theta_b}{\pi} + \left( \frac{1}{2} - \Delta_b \right) \frac{\sin(2\theta_b)}{\sin(2\pi \Delta_b)} = \frac{1}{2} + p. \] (7.30)

The last two equations follow from Luttinger theorems, similar to those discussed in Section V.B (Georges et al., 2001; Gu et al., 2020).

The interesting critical solution is the one in which the \( t \) and \( J \) terms contribute the same power-law singularities at low frequency, and so neither can be neglected in the self-consistency analysis as \( \omega \to 0 \). Such a solution has the exponents \( \Delta_b = \Delta_f = 1/4 \). Inserting the results for \( G_b \) and \( G_f \) into the correlation functions for the electron and spin operators (as in Eq. (6.7)), we obtain for the gauge-invariant observables

\[ \langle c_{\alpha}(\tau) c_{\alpha}^\dagger(0) \rangle \sim \begin{cases} A_+ / |\tau|, & \tau > 0 \\ -A_- / |\tau|, & \tau < 0 \end{cases} \] (7.31)

Remarkably, this non-zero doping critical state has the same spin spectral function as the insulating model in Section VI. The electron Green’s function is similar to that of a Fermi liquid, with the difference that the present large \( M \) limit allows solutions with a particle-hole asymmetry with \( A_+ \neq A_- \), whereas a Fermi liquid always has \( A_+ = A_- \). We note that this is a rather unusual situation in which the \( T = 0 \) spectral function is discontinuous at \( \omega = 0 \); the electron Green’s function obtained from the RG analysis below in Section VII.D.3 does not share this feature. A Fermi liquid would also have a spin correlation function with a \( 1/\tau^2 \) decay (as indicated in Fig. 15), unlike the \( 1/|\tau| \) decay in this critical state.

3. RG analysis for SU(2) symmetry

This section returns to the original \( t-J \) model with SU(2) spin symmetry, as defined by Eqs. (7.19)-(7.21). We will describe a RG treatment similar to that for the insulating quantum magnet presented in Section VI.C. The RG finds a critical point with one relevant direction, which is naturally identified with the deviation of the doping density \( p \) from the critical density \( p_c \). Moreover, the theory of this critical point turns out to be very similar to the large \( M \) theory just described in Section VII.D.2.

We proceed (Joshi et al., 2020) in a manner that parallels Section VI.C. First, we assume power-law decays for the correlators in the action in Eq. (7.19),

\[ Q(\tau) \sim \frac{1}{|\tau|^{d-\gamma}}, \quad R(\tau) \sim \frac{\text{sgn}(\tau)}{|\tau|^\gamma}, \] (7.32)

and ignore the self-consistency condition Eq. (7.21) to begin with. We decouple the \( J^2 \) and \( t^2 \) terms in the action by introducing bosonic \( (\phi_\alpha, \alpha = 1 \ldots 3) \) and fermionic \( (\psi_\alpha) \) baths. Then the problem reduces to solving the impurity Hamiltonian

\[ H_{\text{imp}} = (s_0 + \lambda) f_\alpha^\dagger f_\alpha + \lambda b^\dagger b + g_0(\psi_\alpha^\dagger \psi_\alpha + \text{H.c.}) + \gamma_0 f_\alpha^\dagger \sigma_\alpha^\dagger f_\beta \phi_\alpha(0) + \int k |k|^r dk k \psi_\kappa^\dagger \psi_\kappa + \frac{1}{2} \int d^d x \left[ \frac{\pi_\kappa^2}{2} + (\partial_x \phi_\alpha)^2 \right] \] (7.33)

where the constraint in Eq. (7.15) is imposed exactly by taking \( \lambda \to \infty \) (Fritz and Vojta, 2004), \( \alpha = (x, y, z), \)
\( \sigma^a \) are Pauli matrices, \( \pi_a \) is canonically conjugate to the field \( \phi_a \), and \( \phi_a(0) \equiv 0 \), \( \psi_a(0) \equiv \int |k|^2 dk \psi_{ka} \). We identify \( Q(\tau) \) with the temporal correlator of \( \phi_a(0) \), and \( R(\tau) \) with the temporal correlator of \( \psi_a(0) \), and it can be verified that these correlators decay as in Eq. (7.32).

So we have reduced the problem to an impurity Hamiltonian of a SU(1|2) superspin interacting with separate bosonic and fermionic baths. By analogy with the Bose-Kondo model in Eq. (6.18), we can identify it as a superspin Bose-Fermi-Kondo model, where both the fermionic and bosonic baths have to be determined self-consistently. Such a model can be analyzed by a RG computation which performs the exact path integral over the superspin space i.e. imposes the constraint in Eq. (7.15) exactly. The methods are similar to those used for the insulating spin problem that were used to obtain Eq. (6.20), which ultimately only depended upon the spin commutation relations. In a similar manner, the RG results follow in a similar manner from the SU(1|2) commutation relations in Eq. (7.18). We also note that the same RG equations would have been obtained from the commutation relations of the isomorphic SU(2|1) algebra i.e. we get the same results from the formulation in terms of either the bosonic spinons or the fermionic spinons.

The impurity has 3 coupling constants, and we represent their renormalized values by \( \gamma \), \( g \), and \( s \). The coupling \( \gamma \) measures the coupling to the bosonic bath, just as in Eq. (6.18). Similarly, \( g \) is the coupling to the fermionic bath. We will see shortly that \( g \) and \( \gamma \) can be chosen to be nearly marginal, by appropriate choices of the exponents in Eq. (7.32). The coupling \( s \) tunes the relative energies of the spin and holon states, as is clear from Eq. (7.33). This is the relevant perturbation mentioned at the start of this subsection. For \( s \to +\infty \), the energy of the holon is much lower, and we expect the holon \( b \) to condense, leading to a disordered Fermi liquid. Conversely for \( s \to -\infty \), the spinons will condense (in the SU(2|1) formulation, as illustrated in Fig. 15), leading to a spin glass. And in between, at some \( s = s_c \) we will have the fixed point which describes the critical theory we are interested in. At zeroth order in \( g, \gamma \) the critical point is at \( s_c = 0 \): this corresponds a 3-fold degeneracy in the 3 states of the superspin (see Fig 15), and a doping density \( p_c = 1/3 \). So we have the interesting prediction that the critical doping density of the fully-connected random \( t-J \) model is close to \( p = 1/3 \), a result that is indeed supported by the numerical results (Shackleton et al., 2021) reviewed in Section VII.C.

The one loop RG equations are (Joshi et al., 2020)

\[
\begin{align*}
\beta(g) &= -\bar{r}g + \frac{3}{5}g^3 + \frac{3}{8}g\gamma^2 \\
\beta(\gamma) &= -\frac{3}{2}\gamma + \gamma^3 + g^2\gamma \\
\beta(s) &= -s + 3g^2s - g^2 + \frac{3}{4}\gamma^2.
\end{align*}
\]  

We have introduced the variables

\[
\epsilon = 3 - d \quad , \quad \bar{r} = (1 - r)/2
\]

and it is clear from Eq. (7.34) that the fixed points at small \( \epsilon \) and \( \bar{r} \) are under perturbative control in powers of \( \epsilon \) and \( \bar{r} \). The RG flows in the \( g, \gamma \) plane are shown in Fig. 16: there is an attractive fixed point in this plane at \( g^*, \gamma^* \) of order \( \epsilon, \bar{r} \). The relevant perturbation \( s \) induces flows away from this fixed point in a direction which is predominantly transverse to the \( g, \gamma \) plane. There are also fixed points in Fig. 16 along the \( g = 0 \) line, corresponding to the fixed point of the insulating magnet in Eq. (6.20); and along the \( \gamma = 0 \) line, corresponding to the fixed point of the asymmetric pseudogap Anderson impurity (Fritz and Vojta, 2004; Vojta and Fritz, 2004).

Finally, we can compute the scaling dimensions of the electron and spin operators at the red fixed point of Fig. 16. As in Section VI.C, these scaling dimensions are protected by the Berry phase term in Eq. (7.19) that imposes the SU(1|2) commutation relations at any fixed at non-zero \( g^* \) and \( \gamma^* \). So we are able to compute the exponents in Eq. (7.20) to all loop order; we find

\[
\langle c_\alpha(\tau)c_{\alpha}^\dagger(0) \rangle \sim \frac{\text{sgn}(\tau)}{|\tau|^{1-\epsilon}}
\]

\[
\langle S(\tau) \cdot S(0) \rangle \sim \frac{1}{|\tau|^{3-\bar{r}}}. 
\]

We now restore the self-consistency condition in Eq. (7.21), and find the self-consistent values \( r = 0 \) and...
These self-consistent exponents are in precise accord with the exponents obtained from the large $M$ computation in Eq. (7.31), as was also the case for the insulating magnet in Section VI.C. There is however an interesting difference that will benefit from further study: the electron correlator in Eq. (7.31) is allowed to have particle-hole asymmetry with $A_+ \neq A_-$, but that is not the case for the present RG analysis.

E. Transport in random exchange $t$-$U$-$J$ models

Discussing conductivity requires a slightly different setup than a fully-connected lattice in order to properly define transport and the current operator. One possibility is to consider the model on the Bethe lattice with non-random hopping amplitudes $t_{ij} = t/\sqrt{z}$, with $z$ the connectivity of the lattice. In the limit $z \to \infty$, the self-energy and local Green’s function obey the same equations as the model with random $t_{ij}$ (Georges et al., 1996). Another possibility is to consider a translationally invariant lattice of fully connected dots, as in Section X.

The conductivity is given by the Kubo formula:

$$\sigma_{dc} = \frac{2\pi e^2}{\hbar} \int d\omega \frac{\beta}{4 \cosh^2(\beta\omega/2)} \int d\epsilon \phi(\epsilon) A(\epsilon, \omega)^2.$$  \hfill (7.37)

In this expression, $\epsilon$ is the energy of a bare single-particle state within the band and $A(\epsilon, \omega) = -(1/\pi) \text{Im} G^R(\epsilon, \omega)$ is the energy (momentum-) resolved spectral function. The transport function $\phi(\epsilon)$ is defined on a Bravais lattice by:

$$\phi(\epsilon) = \int \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} v_{kx}^2 \delta(\epsilon - \epsilon_k),$$  \hfill (7.38)

in which $v_{kx} = (\nabla_{kx} f_{kx})/\hbar$ is the velocity in the considered direction. On the infinite-connectivity Bethe lattice $\phi(\epsilon) = \phi(0)[1 - (\epsilon/2t)^2]^{3/2}$ (Georges et al., 1996). Here, we have assumed that the self-energy function follows the energy as well as the 2-particle vertex function only depends on frequency. As a result, because the current vertex is odd in momentum, vertex corrections to the conductivity vanish and the full Kubo formula reduces to the fermionic bubble in Eq. (7.37) (Khurana, 1990). Note that this is not the case for other correlation functions which are even-parity (such as charge or spin) (Georges et al., 1996).

Let us discuss the behaviour of the resistivity following from Eq. (7.37) in two different situations. First, we consider a case in which $\text{Im} \Sigma$ is much larger than the dispersion of the band itself (i.e the range over which $\epsilon$ varies in the integral). Then the dispersion can be entirely neglected and we obtain:

$$\sigma_{dc} \propto \int d\omega \left[ \beta/\left(4 \cosh^2(\beta\omega/2)\right) \right] (\text{Im} \Sigma)^2.$$  \hfill (7.39)

This expression is similar to Drude-Boltzmann theory, but we emphasize that it is valid even when the scattering rate has a non-Fermi liquid form. For example, when $\text{Im} \Sigma = T^\nu f(\omega/T)$, we obtain $\rho \propto T^\nu$; $\nu = 1$ corresponds to a Planckian metal. Evidence for such nFL behavior of the scattering rate was discussed above in the quantum critical regime of the random bond $t$-$J$ and Hubbard models (Cha et al., 2020b; Dumitrescu et al., 2021). We also emphasize, as is well known from transport theory, that the wave function normalisation $Z(T) \propto (1 - \partial \text{Re} \Sigma(\omega, T)/\partial \omega|_{\omega = 0})^{-1}$ does not enter the expression of the conductivity, in contrast to the width of the one-electron spectral function which is $\propto Z(\text{Im} \Sigma)$ (and can be interpreted as the inverse of the quasiparticle lifetime in a Fermi liquid). It is interesting to note that, for a nFL with $\text{Im} \Sigma \propto T^\nu$ and $\nu < 1$, the latter always displays Planckian behavior $\propto T$, independently of the value of the exponent $\nu$ since $Z(T, \omega = 0)$ vanishes as $Z(T) \propto T^{-1-\nu}$. Indeed, the real part of the self-energy is related to the imaginary part by $\text{Re} \Sigma(\omega) = -\int d\omega' \frac{\text{Im} \Sigma(\omega')}{\omega' - \omega} \frac{\pi}{\omega'}$, from which it follows for $\nu < 1$ that $\text{Re} \Sigma(\omega) = T^\nu \dot{f}(\omega/T)$ and hence $1/Z = 1 - \partial \text{Re} \Sigma = 1 - T^{\nu-1} \dot{f}(\omega/T)$; see (Georges and Mravlje, 2021) for details.

We note that Eq. (7.37) also applies to non-random models in the (DMFT) limit of infinite connectivity. An interesting connection was recently noted (Cha et al., 2020a) between the $T$-linear behavior of the resistivity in such models in the high-$T$ bad metal regime (Pålsson and Kotliar, 1998; Perepelitsky et al., 2016) discussed
in Sec. III.A and the SYK equations for the self-energy. Whether such a connection also exists in the lower temperature regime is an interesting open question - for a recent study of $T$-linear resistivity in the non-random Hubbard model using cluster extensions of DMFT, see (Wu et al., 2021). Possible connections between the SYK model and nFL regimes of non-random multi-orbital models have also been pointed out (Tsuij and Werner, 2019; Werner et al., 2018). Relevance of SYK criticality to possible instabilities of ‘Luttinger surfaces’ has also been discussed (Setty, 2020, 2021).

Thermoelectric transport has also been analyzed in random-exchange and SYK models. It was pointed out (Davison et al., 2017; Kruchkov et al., 2020) that the thermopower of a lattice of SYK islands is directly related to the spectral asymmetry parameter $E$ introduced in Eq. (5.25), and hence offers a possible probe of the residual $T = 0$ entropy. That relation may be more involved in general however (Kruchkov et al., 2020; Pavlov and Kiselev, 2021). Recently, (Georges and Mravlje, 2021) emphasized that the intrinsic particle-hole asymmetry of the $\omega/T$ scaling function in Eq. (7.11), characteristic of ‘skewed’ Planckian (or sub-Planckian) metals, has remarkable consequences for the sign and $T$-dependence of the thermopower down to low-$T$, even in the presence of additional elastic scattering. Possible relevance to Seebeck measurements on cuprate superconductors was explored (Gourgout et al., 2021).

**F. General mechanism for $T$-linear resistivity as $T \to 0$ from time reparameterization**

The quantum-critical $T$-linear resistivity computed numerically in Section VII.C (and also in Section VII.B) is somewhat mysterious when compared with the analytical results. Recall that we found a leading Fermi liquid-like behavior in the electron Green’s function at the quantum critical point in the non-Fermi liquid large $M$ limit in Eq. (7.31), and also in the RG analysis for $M = 2$ in Eq. (7.36). The RG analysis also makes clear that this Fermi liquid exponent for the electron operator is likely exact to all orders in $1/M$. Inserting such an electron spectral density in Eq. (7.37), we obtain temperature independent residual resistivity as $T \to 0$, $\rho(0)$. We note that this large residual resistivity, present even for a large dimension lattice without hopping disorder, appears to be an artifact of the non-Fermi liquid large $M$ limit of Section VII.D.2 (Guo et al., 2020). The Fermi liquid large $M$ limit of Section VII.D.1 has vanishing residual resistivity (Parcollet and Georges, 1999), and this also appears to be the case in the numerical study in the SU(2) limit (Dumitrescu et al., 2021). It is possible that the non-Fermi liquid large $M$ limit of Section VII.D.2 has a crossover in the residual resistivity at a frequency which vanishes as $M$ becomes large.

We obtain a $T$-dependence to the resistivity as $T \to 0$ by considering corrections to scaling for the electron operator in the $N = \infty$ theory. The structure of these corrections can be easily deduced from the theory described in Section V.E, which generalizes directly to the $t$-$J$ model (Tikhanovskaya et al., 2021b). As for the entropy in Eq. (5.53), and the spin spectral density in Eq. (6.9), we consider the corrections due to $h = 2$ operator. The scaling dimension of this operator is also ‘protected’ at $h = 2$, given its connection to the Schwarzian theory in Section V.F i.e. it is the ‘time reparameterization’ operator, and the ‘boundary graviton’ in the holographic theory to be discussed in Section XII.B. Therefore, we expect that the $h = 2$ scaling dimensions does not acquire any $1/M$ corrections. By the same arguments leading to Eq. (6.9) for the spin spectral density, we now obtain for the temperature dependence for the resistivity (Guo et al., 2020)

$$\rho(T) = \rho(0) [1 + C_{\rho} \gamma T + \ldots] \, .$$

The linear $T$ dependence is the power $T^{h-1}$, which is related to that in Eq. (5.45), for the time reparameterization mode with $h = 2$. The parameter $\gamma$ is the same as that in the entropy in Eq. (5.53), and $C_{\rho}$ is a dimensionless universal number similar to $C$ in Eq. (6.9). The value of $C_{\rho}$ can be computed in the large $M$ limit of the $t$-$J$ model (Guo et al., 2020). While the co-efficient of linear $T$ resistivity is controlled by the residual resistivity in this large $M$ computation, that is not the case for the numerical SU(2) computation in Fig. 13, with the corresponding phase diagram in Fig. 12 (Dumitrescu et al., 2021). We also note that the large $M$ theory of the doped $t$-$J$ model has operators with $h < 2$; but the scaling dimension of these operators is not protected, and their contribution to the resistivity is numerically small in the large $M$ theory (Tikhanovskaya et al., 2021b).

**G. Experimental relevance**

The models described in this section are, of course, not meant to be microscopically realistic models of materials displaying nFL behaviour, such as the cuprate strange metal. Nonetheless, as we now discuss, the physics of the doped Hubbard and $t$-$J$ models with random exchange couplings exposed above present rather striking similarities with some of the salient phenomenology of the cuprates and can serve as a building block for capturing certain universal aspects of nFL behavior in general. We recall two of the most fundamentally intriguing phenomena observed in these materials:

- The appearance of a pseudogap regime below a critical doping ($p < p^*$). At low $T$ and high fields, quantum oscillations have revealed the existence of pocket Fermi surfaces (Doiron-Leyraud et al.,...
These oscillations appear in a regime with long-range charge density wave order, but it is clear that a simple model of reconstruction of the large Fermi surface by the charge density wave order cannot explain the details of the quantum oscillations. At higher $T$, or at dopings $p_\text{CDW} < p < p^*$ (where $p_\text{CDW}$ is the doping below which there is charge density wave order), there is no known long-range order, and there is clear experimental evidence that the electronic spectrum cannot be described by the large Fermi surface. The observations include angle-dependent magnetoresistance (Fang et al., 2020) and the ‘Fermi arcs’ in angular resolved photoemission spectroscopy (ARPES) (Damasceani et al., 2003).

- Near $p^*$, several properties are evocative of quantum criticality, most notably: (i) $T$-linear resistivity with a transport scattering time obeying Planckian behaviour $\tau \propto a h/k_B T$ down to low temperatures (Bruin et al., 2013; Grissonnanche et al., 2021; Homes et al., 2004; Hussey, 2008; Legros et al., 2019; Varma, 2020; Zaanen, 2004) (ii) $\omega/T$ scaling observed in several spectroscopies, such as optical conductivity (van der Marel et al., 2003) and ARPES (Reber et al., 2019). (iii) A diverging specific-heat coefficient near $p^*$, with logarithmic dependence of $C/T$ upon $T$ at $p = p^*$ (Michon et al., 2019).

Seen in this perspective, the doped random exchange models discussed above offer a simple platform in which to study some of these phenomena. We have reviewed that they display a critical point upon doping at which quantum critical scaling is observed, and that the Luttinger theorem breaks down at this critical doping. We find clear evidence of the Luttinger breakdown in the value of the chemical potential at temperatures above the spin glass transition for $p < p_c$ in the Monte Carlo study (Dumitrescu et al., 2021), and at zero temperature within the metallic spin glass in the exact diagonalization study (Shackleton et al., 2021). The precise nature of the Fermi surface reconstruction, and possible volume collapse, is still to be investigated in the low $T$ metallic spin-glass phase for $p < p_c$, and is one of the fascinating open questions in the field.

Most notably, these doped random exchange and SYK models are among the few theoretical models in which Planckian behaviour of transport (Zaanen, 2004) in the absence of coherent quasiparticles can be studied in a controlled manner (we note investigations of this issue (Varma et al., 1989; Varma, 2016, 2020) in the marginal Fermi liquid context). The randomness of the exchange constants helps introduce ‘frustration’ and is, at the theoretical level, a simple way to account for the fact that the physics of short-range spin correlations is important in the pseudogap phase, but without true long-range order. One can also argue, as emphasized early on (Parcollet and Georges, 1999), that randomness of the exchange constants can be motivated at a more microscopic level. In this respect, recent nuclear magnetic resonance and ultrasound measurements have revealed that, remarkably, the spin-glass phase extends up to $p = p^*$ for $\La_{2-x}\Sr_x\CuO_4$ subject to a high magnetic field (Frachet et al., 2020). The critical theory of the random exchange models is not particle-hole symmetric, and the possible relevance of the intrinsic particle-hole asymmetry of the $\omega/T$ scaling function associated with the scattering rate has been recently emphasized for the interpretation of Seebeck measurements on the cuprates (Georges and Mravlje, 2021; Gourgout et al., 2021).

Another indication of Planckian behavior is the anomalous continuum observed in dynamic charge response measurements (Husain et al., 2019; Mitrano et al., 2018) on optimally doped $\Bi_{2+x}\Sr_{1.9}\Ca_{1.6}\Cu_{2+\delta}\O_{8+x}$ (Bi-2212) using momentum-resolved electron energy-loss spectroscopy (M-EELS). This has been studied in a model with additional random density-density interactions (Joshi and Sachdev, 2020).

### VIII. RANDOM EXCHANGE KONDO-HEISENBERG MODEL

This section will combine the random matrix model of mobile electrons of Section IV with the random quantum magnet of Section VI, and couple them together with a non-random, antiferromagnetic, Kondo exchange coupling $J_K$. So we have the Kondo-Heisenberg Hamiltonian

$$H_{KH} = \frac{1}{(N)^{1/2}} \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} t_{ij} c_{i\alpha}^{\dagger} c_{j\alpha} - \mu \sum_{i} c_{i\alpha}^{\dagger} c_{i\alpha}$$

$$+ \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} J_{ij} \mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j + \frac{J_K}{2} \sum_{i} \mathbf{S}_i \cdot \left( c_{i\alpha}^{\dagger} \sigma_{\alpha\beta} c_{i\beta} \right),$$

which has been used extensively as a theory of numerous rare-earth intermetallics (usually, in the absence of random exchange), the so-called heavy fermion compounds. This model exhibits a ‘heavy Fermi liquid’ (HFL) ground state, which is a Fermi liquid with electron-like quasiparticle excitations with a large effective mass for models with non-random $t_{ij}$. Moreover, the Fermi energy is ‘large’, because the occupied states count both the conduction electrons $c_{i\alpha}$, and the spins $\mathbf{S}_i$. The fully connected random model also has such a heavy Fermi liquid phase which obeys a Luttinger theorem with this large Fermi energy (Burdin et al., 2002; Nikolaenko et al., 2021), as we discuss further in Section VIII.C.

Our interest here is in other possible phases of the Kondo-Heisenberg lattice model, and on the quantum critical points to these phases starting from the HFL. A possibility of particular interest is the ‘fractionalized
Fermi liquid (FL) (Burdin et al., 2002; Paramekanti and Vishwanath, 2004; Senthil et al., 2003, 2004) in which the Fermi surface is ‘small’ and includes only the volume of the conduction electrons. The spins \( S_i \) form a spin liquid state with fractionalized excitations, and the fractionalized excitations are required to exist to allow deviation of the Fermi surface volume from the Luttinger value (Bonderson et al., 2016; Else et al., 2021; Paramekanti and Vishwanath, 2004; Senthil et al., 2004); we also note other discussions of FL* and related states (Andrei and Coleman, 1989; Chowdhury et al., 2018; Coleman et al., 2005a; Paschen and Si, 2021; Paul et al., 2007, 2008, 2013; Pixley et al., 2014; Si, 2010). In the random fully connected model, the \( S_i \) spins form the SYK spin liquid of Section VI in the large \( M \) limit, as we will describe in Section VIII.B. A number of recent experiments have reported the existence of a paramagnetic metallic phase with a Fermi surface volume that does not appear to include the local moment electrons in YbRh\(_2\)(Si\(_{0.95}\)Ge\(_{0.05}\))\(_2\) (Custers et al., 2010; Custers et al., 2003), CePdAl (Zhao et al., 2021), and CeCoIn\(_5\) (Maksimovic et al., 2020), which shares resemblance with some aspects of the FL* phase.

A third possible phase of the Kondo-Heisenberg lattice model has broken spin rotation symmetry, and associated magnetic order. For the random fully connected model in Eq. (8.1) with SU(2) spin symmetry, this is likely realized as a spin glass phase. We will discuss a RG analysis of the SU(2) model in Section VIII.D, and this has a fixed point which is expected to describe the transition from the spin glass to the HFL. There have been a number of experimental studies of such a transition (Aronson et al., 1995; Gannon et al., 2018; Schröder et al., 1998; Seaman et al., 1991; Shimizu et al., 2012; Soldevilla et al., 2000; Theumann and Coqblin, 2004; Vollmer et al., 2000; Zapf et al., 2001) in the heavy-fermion compounds.

We refer the reader to other reviews (Kirchner et al., 2020; Stewart, 2001) for further discussion of the connections between the Kondo-Heisenberg model and experiments on the heavy-fermion compounds.

### A. Effective local action

We begin our analysis, as in Section VII.A, by averag- ing over disorder, and formulating the problem in terms of self-consistent single site problem. We average over the \( h_{ij} \) and \( J_{ij} \) in Eq. (8.1), and in the large \( N \) limit we obtain the following single site averaged partition function

\[
\bar{Z}_{KH} = \int Dc_\alpha(\tau) DS(\tau) \delta(S_\alpha^2 - 1)e^{-S_B - S_{KH}}
\]

\[
S_B = \frac{i}{2} \int_0^1 du \int d\tau S \cdot \left( \frac{\partial S}{\partial \tau} \times \frac{\partial S}{\partial u} \right)
+ \int d\tau \left[ c_{\alpha}^\dagger \frac{\partial c_{\alpha}}{\partial \tau} \right]
\]

\[
S_{KH} = \int d\tau \left[ -\mu c_{\alpha}^\dagger c_{\alpha} + \frac{J_K}{2} S \cdot (c_{\alpha}^\dagger \sigma_{\alpha \beta} c_{\beta}) \right]
- \frac{J_N^2}{2} \int d\tau d\tau' Q(\tau - \tau') S(\tau) \cdot S(\tau')
- t^2 \int d\tau d\tau' R(\tau - \tau') c_{\alpha}^\dagger(\tau) c_{\alpha}(\tau') + H.c. \tag{8.2}
\]

From this action we determined the correlators

\[
\bar{R}(\tau - \tau') = -\frac{1}{2} \langle c_{\alpha}(\tau) c_{\alpha}^\dagger(\tau') \rangle_{Z_{KH}}
\]

\[
\bar{Q}(\tau - \tau') = \frac{1}{3} \langle S(\tau) \cdot S(\tau') \rangle_{Z_{KH}} \tag{8.3}
\]

and finally impose the self-consistency conditions

\[
R(\tau) = \bar{R}(\tau), \quad Q(\tau) = \bar{Q}(\tau) \tag{8.4}
\]

As was the case for the t-J model in Section VII.D, closely related equations can also be obtained for the case of non-random \( t_{ij} \), involving an electron dispersion \( \epsilon_k \).

It is interesting to note the difference between the single-site self-consistency problem for the t-J model of Section VII.D, and the present Kondo-Heisenberg model. The Berry phase term \( S_B \) reflects the different quantum degrees of freedom on the site: (i) for the t-J model we have the 3 states of the SU(1/2) superspin described above; (ii) for the Kondo-Heisenberg model we have the 2 state of the SU(2) spin 1/2 \( S \), and the 4 states of the electron \( c_{\alpha} \), for a total of 8 states. Both models have very similar bosonic and fermionic baths, but do differ in the on-site Hamiltonian: the present model has a Kondo coupling \( J_K \).

The self-consistent single-site quantum problem defined by Eqs. (8.2.8.3.8.4) cannot be solved exactly, and we will address it in the following subsections by the same methods used earlier for the random quantum magnet problem defined by Eqs. (6.11.6.12.6.13), and the Hubbard model problem defined by Eqs. (7.4.7.5.7.6).

### B. SU(M) symmetry with \( M \) large

The large \( M \) analysis of the fully connected Kondo-Heisenberg model (Burdin et al., 2002) proceeds by generalizing the model in Eqs. (8.2)-(8.4) to SU(M) symmetry just as in Section VLA for the random quantum magnet. We introduce fermionic spinons \( f_{\alpha} \), \( \alpha = 1 \ldots M \), treat the random \( J_{ij} \) exchange as in Section VLA, and decouple by \( J_K \) exchange by a bosonic field \( P(\tau) \sim \)
Finally, the hybridization parameter, $P$, is determined by the self-consistency equation

$$P = J_K G_{fc}(\tau = 0^-).$$

The equations can be obtained from a $G$-$\Sigma$ action analogous to Eqs. (5.56) and (6.6)

$$I[G, \Sigma, \Delta, \lambda, P] = \int_0^\beta d\tau \left[ \frac{\left| P(\tau) \right|^2}{J_K} - \frac{i\lambda(\tau)}{2} \right]$$

$$- \ln \det \left[ (\partial_{\tau_1} + i\lambda(\tau_1))\delta(\tau_1 - \tau_2) + \Sigma_f(\tau_1, \tau_2)$$

$$- P^*(\tau_1)\delta(\tau_1 - \tau_2)$$

$$- P(\tau_1)\delta(\tau_1 - \tau_2)$$

$$+ \delta(\tau_1 - \tau_2) + \Delta(\tau_1, \tau_2)$$

$$- \text{Tr}(\Delta \cdot G_c) + \frac{J^2}{2} \text{Tr}(G_f \cdot G_f)$$

$$- \text{Tr}(\Sigma_f \cdot G_f) - \frac{J^2}{4} \text{Tr}(G^2_f \cdot G^2_f).$$

A complete solution of Eqs. (8.5-8.7) requires a numerical analysis, but much can be understood from a low frequency analysis similar to those in the preceding subsections (Burdin et al., 2002). The phase diagram as a function of $T$ and $J$ is shown in Fig. 17. A key determinant of the phase structure is the value of $P$. We have $P \neq 0$ below the line labeled $T_K$ in Fig. 17: this line approaches the single site Kondo temperature in the limit $J \rightarrow 0$. In this regime we have the HFL phase, in which both the spins and the electrons are part of the Fermi volume, as described in more detail in Section VIII.C. The transition across the line where $P$ vanishes is expected to turn into a smooth crossover once $1/M$ corrections have been included, as there is no underlying order in the HFL phase at $T > 0$.

In this manner, Eqs. (8.2)-(8.4) reduce to the following equations for the fermion Green’s functions, self energies, and time-independent saddle-point values $i\lambda(\tau) = \bar{\lambda}$ and $P(\tau) = \bar{P}$. The Green’s function acquires ‘band’ indices associated with the $f$ and $c$ fermions, and so Dyson’s equation has a matrix form

$$\begin{pmatrix}
G_f(i\omega_n) & G_{fc}(i\omega_n) \\
G_{cf}(i\omega_n) & G_c(i\omega_n)
\end{pmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix}
\frac{i\omega_n - \bar{\lambda} - \Sigma_f(i\omega_n)}{-\bar{P}} & -\frac{\bar{P}}{i\omega_n + \mu - \Delta(i\omega_n)}
\end{pmatrix}.$$
where $\rho_Q(\Omega)$ is the SYK spin spectral density obtained in Eq. (6.8). This leads to marginal Fermi liquid behavior (Varma et al., 1989) for the small density of conduction electrons, with $\text{Im} \Sigma_c(\omega = 0) \sim T$, and a linear-in-$T$ resistivity, using transport computations as defined in Section VII.E.

This mechanism for the linear-in-$T$ resistivity in the Kondo lattice model is distinct from that for the $t$-$J$ model in Section VII.F. Here the carrier density at the critical point is small, i.e. it does not involve the spins due to the breakdown of the Kondo effect. In contrast, the carrier density in Section VII.F was large, involving all the electrons. Moreover, here the linear-in-$T$ resistivity arises already in the leading scaling results for the SYK model, while those in Section VII.F required corrections to scaling.

C. Luttinger theorem

The Luttinger theorem is normally applied to metallic phases of electrons, and we obtained an instance of this in Section VII.D.1 for the Fermi liquid phase of the $t$-$J$ model. But we also saw a modified Luttinger theorem in Section VI.A for spins in an insulating Kondo magnet. The Kondo Hamiltonian Eq. (8.1) has both spins and mobile electrons, and there now are distinct realizations of the Luttinger theorem in the HFL and FL* phases (Senthil et al., 2003, 2004).

It is convenient to present the discussion in the large $M$ formulation of the theory in Section VIII.B, although all statements in the present subsection hold to all orders in $1/M$. When expressed in terms of the spinons $f_n$, the theory in Eq. (8.2) has a U(1) gauge symmetry, along with global U(1) symmetries associated with the total charge of the $c_\alpha$ electrons, $(M/2)p$, and the total spin $S_z$. In principle, all 3 U(1) symmetries will lead to their own and distinct Luttinger constraints, unless there are condensates of bosons carrying U(1) charges (Coleman et al., 2005b; Powell et al., 2005) (we review this connection between U(1) symmetries and the Luttinger constraints at the end of Section XI.A.2). In our discussion, the relevant boson is the hybridization $P \sim c_\alpha^\dagger f_n$, and this is a Higgs boson because it carries a U(1) gauge charge.

(A) FL* phase

In the FL* phase, there is no Higgs condensate $\langle P \rangle \neq 0$, so all 3 Luttinger constraints apply. An important property of this phase is that the off-diagonal Green’s function vanishes at all frequencies $G_{tc} = 0$. Consequently, the constraints arising from the gauge U(1) and $S_z$ symmetries are essentially identical to those considered for insulating quantum magnets in Section VI.A, which are in turn related to the discussion in Section V.B. So we need only consider the constraint associated with $c_\alpha$ fermion charge, which is

$$G_c(\tau = 0^-) = \frac{P}{2}. \quad (8.10)$$

We can write $G_c$ in the FL* phase in the general form

$$G_c(i\omega_n) = \frac{1}{i\omega_n + \mu - t^2 G_c(i\omega_n) - \Sigma_c(i\omega_n)} \quad (8.11)$$

We have now included a self-energy $\Sigma_c(i\omega_n)$ which arises from $1/M$ corrections. This obeys $\text{Im} \Sigma_c(i0^+) = 0$ at $T = 0$, and that is not the case for $\Delta(\omega)$ in Eq. (8.6). Another important point is that $1/M$ contributions to $\Sigma_c(i\omega_n)$ can be obtained from a Luttinger-Ward functional, and the Luttinger constraint will then follow straightforwardly.

First, we solve Eq. (8.11) to write

$$G_c(i\omega_n) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\Omega \frac{\rho(\Omega)}{i\omega_n + \mu - \Sigma_c(i\omega_n) - \Omega} \quad (8.12)$$

where $\rho(\Omega)$ is the single particle density of states of the random matrix model in Eq. (4.8). We now proceed with the analysis of the Luttinger constraint as in Section V.B: we expect that the contribution from the frequency derivative of the self energy vanishes, $I_2 = 0$, and then such an analysis shows that Eq. (8.10) implies

$$\int_{-2t}^{E_F} d\Omega \rho(\Omega) = \frac{P}{2}, \quad (8.13)$$

where the Fermi energy is

$$E_F = \mu - \Sigma_c(0). \quad (8.14)$$

We note that the analog of the analysis above applies also to the disordered Fermi liquid phase of Section VII.D.1 (Parcollet and Georges, 1999).

(B) HFL phase

In the HFL phase of the Kondo-Heisenberg lattice, we do have a Higgs condensate $\langle P \rangle \neq 0$, and so there is no separate Luttinger constraint from the U(1) gauge symmetry. The analysis of the Luttinger constraint (Burdi et al., 2000) with the conservation of the electron charge will now lead to a ‘large’ Fermi energy of size $(1 + p)/2$ per spin (for the particle-hole symmetric value $\kappa = 1/2$ in Eq. (6.2) for the SU(M) spins).

We begin by writing Dyson’s equation in Eq. (8.5) in a general form valid beyond the large M limit. We define an auxiliary matrix Green’s function by

$$[G(i\omega_n, \Omega)]^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} i\omega_n - \Xi & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} - \Sigma(i\omega_n) \quad (8.15)$$

where $\Sigma(i\omega_n)$ is the matrix self energy which obeys $\text{Im} \Sigma(i0^+) = 0$ at $T = 0$. As in Eq. (8.12), we have replaced the $t^2 G_c(i\omega_n)$ in Eqs. (8.5) and (8.6) by $\Omega$. The
presence of the Higgs condensate in the HFL phase requires that the off-diagonal matrix elements of \( \Sigma(i\omega_n) \) are non-zero, and this is crucial for the Luttinger constraint here.

We now state a useful identity, which can be verified by explicit computation, for the trace of the matrix Green’s function \( G(i\omega) \) (which counts both the \( f_\alpha \) and \( c_\alpha \) fermions)

\[
\text{Tr} \ G(i\omega) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\Omega \rho(\Omega) \left[ i \frac{d}{d\omega} \ln \text{det}[G(i\omega,\Omega)] - i \text{Tr} \left( G(i\omega,\Omega) \frac{d}{d\omega} \Sigma(i\omega) \right) \right]. \quad (8.16)
\]

Notice the similarity of Eq. (8.16) to the identity used for the SYK model in Eq. (5.15). The subsequent analysis proceeds as there. In the present situation, the \( I_2 \) contribution of the second term in Eq. (8.16) vanishes from the usual Luttinger-Ward functional argument because we are in a Fermi liquid phase and there is no anomaly at \( \omega = 0 \). For \( p < 1 \), the first term in Eq. (8.16) yields the Luttinger constraint (Burin et al., 2000; Nikolaenko et al., 2021)

\[
\int_{-2t}^{E_F} d\Omega \rho(\Omega) = \frac{1 + p}{2}, \quad (8.17)
\]

which, unlike Eq. (8.13), counts both the \( c_\alpha \) electrons and the spins. The expression for the Fermi energy in Eq. (8.14) is now replaced by

\[
\det \left[ G(0, E_F) \right]^{-1} = 0. \quad (8.18)
\]

**D. RG analysis for SU(2) symmetry**

We will now analyze \( Z_{KH} \) in Eq. (8.2) by combining the RG analysis of Section V.LC with the ‘poor-man’s scaling’ RG of the Kondo problem.

This analysis will be carried out perturbatively in \( J_K \), as in the ‘poor-man’s scaling’ (Hewson, 1997). Then at leading order, with \( J_K = 0 \) but the mean-square hopping \( t \) arbitrary, the equations for the \( c_\alpha \) Green’s function reduce precisely to those solved earlier in Section IV for the random matrix problem. These yield a fermion Green’s function with a constant density of states at the Fermi level \( \sim 1/t \), as in Eq. (4.8). Note that this is a Fermi level only of the \( e \) electrons, and so is a ‘small’ Fermi ‘surface’: so the present RG analysis is an expansion about the small Fermi surface. After a Fourier transform, the constant density of states implies \( G(\tau) \sim 1/(\tau \tau) \) at large \(|\tau|\).

We therefore replace the fermion \( c_\alpha \) with a ‘bath’ fermion \( \psi_\alpha \), which is the analog of the bosonic field \( \phi_\alpha \) that we introduced in Section VI.C for the random quantum magnet. Similarly, we endow \( \psi_\alpha \) with a momentum and a dispersion, with the dispersion chosen so that \( \psi_\alpha(x = 0) \) has the same temporal correlator as that of \( c_\alpha \). In this manner, we can express the problem in terms of an impurity Hamiltonian of a single \( S = 1/2 \) spin coupled to fermionic and bosonic baths (Sengupta, 2000)

\[
H_{\text{imp}} = \gamma S \cdot \phi(0) + \frac{J_K}{2} S \cdot (\psi_\alpha^\dagger(0) \sigma_{\alpha\beta} \psi_\beta(0)) + \int dk \ k \ \psi_\alpha^\dagger(0) \psi_\alpha + \frac{1}{2} \int d^d x \left[ \pi_\alpha^2 + (\partial_x \phi_\alpha)^2 \right]. \quad (8.19)
\]

The bath correlators are

\[
Q(\tau) \sim \frac{1}{|\tau|^{d-1}}, \quad R(\tau) \sim \text{sgn}(\tau). \quad (8.20)
\]

and the value of \( d \) is to be determined by solving the self-consistency condition for \( Q \) in Eq. (8.4). We have argued above that the self-consistency condition for \( R \) is satisfied by a Fermi liquid constant density of states (of the small Fermi surface) at the Fermi level, and that dictated the \( R(\tau) \) in Eq. (8.20).

The impurity Hamiltonian in Eq. (8.19) has two couplings, \( J_K \) and \( \gamma \) and their RG flow equations can be computed by combining the analyses of the usual Kondo model (Hewson, 1997) and those for the random quantum magnet in Eq. (6.20). This analysis is perturbative in \( J_K \) and \( \epsilon = 3 - d \), and the one loop RG equations are (Sengupta, 2000; Smith and Si, 1999; Zhu and Si, 2002)

\[
\beta(\gamma) = -\frac{\epsilon}{2} \gamma + \gamma^3
\]

\[
\beta(J_K) = \gamma^2 J_K - J_K^2. \quad (8.21)
\]
The resulting RG flow is plotted in Fig. 18. The random quantum magnet fixed point of Section VI.C is stable to turning on a small $J_K$, implying the stability of a small Fermi surface phase. For SU(2), this small Fermi surface phase has spin glass order; but more generally in models which are not fully connected, it could be a spin liquid, leading to a FL* state as in Section VIII.B. For larger $J_K$, there is an unstable fixed point beyond which the flow is towards $J_K \to \infty$, presumably to a large Fermi surface HFL. We have labeled this fixed point as ‘Kondo breakdown’ (Burdin et al., 2002; Sengupta, 2000; Senthil et al., 2003, 2004; Si et al., 2001, 2003) because it separates the HFL phase with Kondo screening, from the small Fermi surface without Kondo screening.

It remains to solve the self-consistency equation in Eq. (8.4) to determine the value of $\epsilon$. As in Sections VI.C and VII.D.3, the scaling dimension of the spin operator can be determined (Zhu and Si, 2002) to all orders at fixed point $\gamma^* \neq 0$, and we find the same result as in Eq. (7.36). The self-consistent value is again $\epsilon = 1, d = 2$, as for the $t$-$J$ model.

It is interesting to compare the RG flow diagram for the Kondo-Heisenberg model in Fig. 18 with that for the $t$-$J$ model in Fig. 16. In both cases, we have a critical fixed point with one relevant direction, and similar critical correlators for the electron and spin operators: a Fermi liquid-like critical electron correlator, and a SYK-like critical spin correlator, as in Eqs. (7.36) for $d = 2$ and $r = 0$. However the density of electrons participating in the electron correlator in Eq. (7.36) is different in the two cases: at the Kondo breakdown fixed point the density of electrons is small, and does not count the spins (as is clear from Section VIII.C for $P = 0$, and from the large $M$ analysis in Section VIII.B), while at the $t$-$J$ model fixed point the density of electrons is large and counts all electrons.

### E. Numerical analysis

A complete numerical analysis of the single-site, self-consistent quantum problem defined by Eqs. (8.2,8.3,8.4) with SU(2) symmetry has not yet been carried out. However, there have been a number of studies of related models, motivated by an uncontrolled EDMFT analysis of low dimensional models with non-random exchange (Kirchner et al., 2020; Si et al., 2001, 2003), and a self-consistency condition of the spin correlator which differs from that in Eq. (8.4). The self-consistency on spin correlators has only been systematically justified in models with random exchange, like those considered above, as we noted at the end of Section VII.A. The numerical analyses were carried out for Ising spin symmetry (Glossop and Ingersent, 2007; Grempel and Si, 2003; Zhu et al., 2003, 2007), although recent works have also examined SU(2) spin symmetry (Cai et al., 2020; Hu et al., 2020).

Aspects of these studies are similar to the RG results described in Section VIII.D, with a SYK-like spin spectral density (i.e. spin correlations similar to Eq. (6.23)) at a critical point between a Fermi liquid phase and another phase which is presumed to break spin symmetry.

### IX. OVERVIEW OF NUMERICAL ALGORITHMS FOR FULLY CONNECTED SU(2) MODELS

In the large-$M$ limit, the action in Eq. (7.4) is solved using a saddle point technique, which reduces to non-linear integral equations for the Green function $G$ as in Eq. (5.2) and a simple expression of higher correlators in terms of $G$ using Wick’s theorem. The SU(2) case is more complex. The action in Eq. (7.4) is still a (local) quantum many body problem (at $J = 0$, it is the Anderson quantum impurity model) and more advanced algorithms are required to solve it.

In this section, we provide a brief introduction for non-experts to the algorithms used to solve the SU(2) models discussed above and discuss their strengths and limitations. The goal is to solve the local action in Eq. (7.4), for fixed bath $\Delta$ and retarded spin-spin interaction $J$. The self-consistency condition on $\Delta$ and $J$ is then solved with an iterative technique (Georges et al., 1996). Note however that the self-consistency can generate a non trivial frequency dependence for the bath $\Delta$ and the interaction $J$, respectively, which complicates the solution. For example, any technique based on a flat bath spectral function with a large high energy cut-off, e.g. integrability, is inoperable in this context.

A lot of progress has been made in the last two decades on numerical algorithms to solve such quantum impurity models with complex baths and interactions, in the context of DMFT and its extensions (Gull et al., 2011). Several classes of algorithms are available, in particular action based Quantum Monte Carlo (QMC) or Hamiltonian based methods (exact diagonalization, NRG, DMRG, tensor network methods). The QMC are the methods of choice here, due to the retarded spin-spin interaction term in Eq. (7.4).

The SU(2) insulating case was studied first in the paramagnetic phase using an auxiliary field QMC (Grempel and Rozenberg, 1998), with a sampling method of the auxiliary field in the Matsubara frequency space. Local moments solutions were obtained at low temperatures, as discussed in Section VI.B (Dumitrescu et al., 2021; Grempel and Rozenberg, 1998).

Recent works however have used the “Continuous Time” QMC (CTQMC) family of algorithms for quantum impurity models. The central idea is to perform an expansion of the partition function $Z$ either in powers of the interaction $U$ and $J$ around the non-interacting limit (CT-INT (Rubtsov et al., 2005) or CT-AUX(Gull et al., 2008) algorithms), or in powers of the bath hybridisation...
$\Delta$ around the atomic limit (CT-HYB algorithm (Werner et al., 2006)).

Let us consider first the CT-INT algorithm, used in Sections VII.B and VII.C (Cha et al., 2020b; Dumitrescu et al., 2021). The partition function $Z$

$$Z = \int Dc_{\sigma}^{+}(\tau)Dc_{\sigma}(\tau)e^{-S_{UJ}(c_{\sigma}^{+}(\tau),c_{\sigma}(\tau))}$$

(9.1)

is expanded in both $U$ and $J$ to any order as

$$Z = \sum_{n \geq 0} \sum_{p \geq 0} \frac{(-U)^n}{n!p!} \int_{0}^{\beta} \prod_{i=1}^{n} d\tau_i \prod_{j=1}^{p} d\tau'_j d\tau''_j \sum_{\sigma_j=\pm} \left\langle T_{\sigma_j} \prod_{i=1}^{n} c_{\sigma_j}^{+}(\tau_i)c_{\sigma_j}(\tau'_j) \prod_{j=1}^{p} S^{\sigma_j}(\tau'_j) S^{\sigma_j}(\tau''_j) \right\rangle_{0} .$$

(9.2)

The average is taken in the non-interacting model $U = J = 0$ and, via Wick’s theorem, can be expressed as a determinant in terms of the non-interacting impurity Greens function.

The principle of the CTQMC is to sample $Z$ stochastically with a Metropolis Monte Carlo algorithm, computing integrals of various dimensions simultaneously. A Monte Carlo is defined by its configuration space and the elementary steps constituting the Markov chain in this space. Discretizing the integrals with a Riemann sum on a regular grid of step $\delta\tau$, the configurations $C$ are simply given by the orders $n$ and $p$ and the set of $\tau_i, \tau'_j, \tau''_j$. Formally, $Z$ can then be written as

$$Z = \sum_{n \geq 0} \sum_{p \geq 0} \sum_{C_{np}} (\delta\tau)^{n+2p} f_{C_{np}}(\tau_i, \tau'_j, \tau''_j)$$

(9.3)

where $f_{C_{np}}$ is given by the time-ordered correlator in Eq. (9.2). The weight of a configuration $C_{np}$ is $w_{C_{np}} = (\delta\tau)^{n+2p} f_{C_{np}} \cdot$ The MC Markov chain consists of elementary steps in adding or removing one (or two) vertices at some randomly chosen times, sampling all the integrals simultaneously. The various correlation functions are then computed from this Markov chain, as their expansions are very similar (Gull et al., 2011). The typical order of the expansion explored by the algorithm can be shown to be proportional to $\beta$, and in practice can go up up to several hundreds. In this model, CT-INT can develop a sign problem at low temperature in some parameter regimes due to the $J$ term. In practice however it can often be strongly reduced by using Gaussian counter-terms added to both the bare action and the $U$ interaction term (Dumitrescu et al., 2021; Rubtsof et al., 2005).

The CT-HYB algorithm is similar to CT-INT but is based on a double expansion around the atomic limit, i.e. in powers of $\Delta(\tau)$, and $\mathcal{J}_\perp$ where the retarded spin-spin interaction is rewritten $\mathcal{J} \mathcal{S}(\tau) \cdot \mathcal{S}(\tau') = \mathcal{J}_\perp \mathcal{S}(\tau) \mathcal{S}(\tau') + \mathcal{J}_\perp \sum_{a=\pm} \mathcal{S}(\tau) \mathcal{S}^{-a}(\tau')$. Expanding Eq. (9.1) in $\Delta$ and $\mathcal{J}_\perp$, and using the antisymmetric property of time-ordered fermionic correlators, the partition function $Z$ reads

$$Z = \sum_{n \geq 0} \sum_{p \geq 0} \frac{J_{np}^{\perp}}{p!n!} \int_{0}^{\beta} \prod_{i=1}^{n} d\tau_i \prod_{j=1}^{p} d\tau'_j \prod_{j=1}^{p} d\tau''_j \times \sum_{\sigma_j=\pm} \sum_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} \det [\Delta_{\sigma_j}(\tau_i - \tau'_j)] \times \left\langle T_{\sigma_j} \prod_{i=1}^{n} c_{\sigma_j}^{+}(\tau_i)c_{\sigma_j}(\tau'_j) \prod_{j=1}^{p} S^{\sigma_j}(\tau'_j) S^{\sigma_j}(\tau''_j) \right\rangle_{\text{atomic}}$$

(9.4)

where the atomic correlators are taken in the isolated atom, i.e. $\Delta = 0$ and $\mathcal{J}_\perp = 0$. The CT-HYB algorithm was introduced in the DMFT case $\mathcal{J} = 0$ (Werner et al., 2006), and later extended to the EDMFT case $\mathcal{J} \neq 0$ (Otsuki, 2013; Otsuki and Vollhardt, 2013). The $\mathcal{J}_\perp$ component of the retarded spin-spin interaction can be taken into account exactly in the atomic correlator. The second expansion in $\mathcal{J}_\perp$ is however necessary, since no efficient algorithm is known to compute the atomic correlators with a full non abelian spin-spin interaction term.

The CTQMC algorithms provide an exact solution in Matsubara time. The main advantage over the previous generation of QMC impurity solvers (Hirsch and Fye, 1986) is the ability to treat general atomic interactions, including retarded interactions, and the absence of time discretization as the algorithm can be performed directly in the continuous time limit $\delta\tau \rightarrow 0$ (hence their name). This last point can be illustrated easily, e.g. on a CT-INT. Let us consider a Monte Carlo step from a configuration $C$ of order $(n, p)$ to a configuration $C'$ of order $(n+1, p)$. Their weights $w_{C}$ and $w_{C'}$ are proportional to $(\delta\tau)^{n+2p}$ and $(\delta\tau)^{n+1+2p}$ respectively as seen in Eq. (9.3). However, the Markov chain steps can be chosen so that the Metropolis ratio

$$R_{C \rightarrow C'} = \frac{T_{C\rightarrow C'} w_{C'}}{T_{C'\rightarrow C} w_{C}}$$

(9.5)

(where $T_{C\rightarrow C'}$ is the proposition probability of the step), is finite for $\delta\tau \rightarrow 0$. Indeed, $R_{C\rightarrow C'} = \delta\tau/\beta$ (the probability to randomly pick up one new time on the imaginary axis), and $T_{C'\rightarrow C} = 1/(n+1)$ (the probability to randomly select one time to remove from the configuration $C'$). As $R$ controls the Metropolis algorithm, its finite limit ensures the continuous time limit of the algorithm, even though the weights themselves vanish at $\delta\tau \rightarrow 0$. The absence of time grid extrapolation is a great advantage in practice at low temperatures.

The main limitations of the CTQMC includes some sign problem (depending on the exact algorithm and the parameter regime), a poor scaling with temperature (like $\beta^3$), and most importantly their restriction to imaginary time. Some delicate analytical continuation are required.
to access real field correlations. Note that a third generation of QMC for impurity problems has recently appeared that work directly in real time (Cohen et al., 2015; Proho et al., 2015; Macek et al., 2020). They are based on diagrammatic computations of physical quantities rather than the partition function. It is an open question whether these new approaches, when properly generalized to handle the retarded spin spin interaction, will allow to solve some of the remaining challenge in these systems, including e.g. the low temperature behavior.

X. LATTICE MODELS OF SYK-ATOMS

This section returns to the SYK model of Section V, and follows a different strategy towards connecting it to the physics of quantum matter. In Sections VI, VII, and VIII we imposed ‘Mottness’ on the SYK model by adding an on-site repulsion on each site $i$; this approach then connected natural to dynamic mean field theories of correlated materials. The present section will examine an alternative approach in which the SYK model is viewed as a multi-orbital atom, and $i$ labels the orbitals on such an atom. Then we will examine a lattice of such ‘SYK-atoms’, and find that such models can also exhibit regimes of non-Fermi liquid behavior with linear-in-$T$ resistivity. For models with a single band of SYK-atoms, these non-Fermi liquids are invariably ‘bad metals’ at temperatures higher than the renormalized bandwidth, in that the resistivity exceeds the MIR resistivity, where the quantum of resistance is redefined as $\frac{h}{Ne^2}$ for the $N$-orbital atom. This is in contrast to the non-Fermi liquids obtained using a two-band generalization of these models in Sec. X.B, or, those introduced earlier in Section VII, which display resistivities smaller than the MIR resistivity.

The models described in this section are interested in describing the anomalous transport properties of non-Fermi liquid metals with short-ranged interactions in crystalline settings. We seek to address the fate of the electronic Fermi surface in the regime of strong interactions when there are no long-lived low energy quasiparticles. Therefore it is natural to address the extent to which the models introduced thus far can serve as elementary building blocks for addressing these fundamental questions in a controlled setting. In the next few subsections, we discuss properties of a number of different variants of the SYK models.

A. Breakdown of a heavy Fermi liquid

We begin by writing a model for electrons with orbital labels $i = 1, 2, ..., N$ and hopping on the sites, $r$, of a $d$-dimensional hyper-cubic lattice (Fig. 19). The Hamiltonian, $H_c = H_{\text{kin}} + H_{\text{int}}$, is given by

$$H_{\text{kin}} = -\sum_{r,r'} t_{rr'} c^\dagger_{r_i} c_{r'_i} - \mu \sum_i c^\dagger_{r_i} c_{r_i}$$  \hspace{1cm} (10.1a)$$

$$H_{\text{int}} = \frac{1}{(2N)^{3/2}} \sum_r \sum_{i,j,k,l=1}^N U_{ij;kl} c^\dagger_{r_i} c^\dagger_{r_j} c_{r_k} c_{r_l}$$ \hspace{1cm} (10.1b)

The above Hamiltonian is thus a generalization of a completely $(0+1)$-dimensional model, $\mathcal{H}_2 + \mathcal{H}_4$, as introduced in Eqs. (4.1a) and (5.1a), respectively. The simplest choice for the hopping and interaction parameters is to make them both random variables (Song et al., 2017). Alternatively, the hopping parameters can be made translationally invariant such that they depend only on the spatial separation, $|r-r'|$ (Haldar et al., 2018; Zhang, 2017). Of special interest is the situation where additionally the interaction terms, $U_{ij;kl}$, are also assumed to be independent of the site label $r$ (Chowdhury et al., 2018). Then, $H_{\text{int}}$ is constructed as a repeated array of the $H_4$ term in Eq. (5.1a) for every site $r$ and the $U_{ij;kl}$ are identical at every site, thereby preserving an exact (instead of statistical) translational invariance. The couplings are still chosen from a Gaussian random distribution with zero mean $U_{ij;kl} = 0$ and variance $|U_{ij;kl}|^2 = U^2$. Appealing to the self-averaging properties of the SYK model in the large-$N$ limit, we can compute correlation functions of a typical translationally invariant realization (where crystalline momentum is a good quantum number) by averaging over the disorder realizations. The chemical potential, $\mu$, allows us to tune the electron density $Q$. Variants of the one-band lattice model without any hopping terms (i.e. $t_{rr'} = 0$) and with only four-fermion interactions that couple together different sites have also been studied (Davison et al., 2017; Gu et al., 2017b), with properties that are vastly different from what we discuss below. A different family of lattice SYK models defined in terms of Majorana fermions have been used to study insulating transitions out of a diffusive metal (Jian et al., 2017; Jian and Yao, 2017) and effects of longer ranged correlated couplings on diffusive transport (Khveschenko, 2018b).

In the large-$N$ limit, once again only the ‘melon graphs’ survive (Fig. 6), but the Green’s function now includes an additional contribution due to $H_{\text{kin}}$ and takes a more non-trivial form compared to Eqs. (5.2a) and (5.2b):

$$G(i\omega_n, k) = \frac{1}{i\omega_n - \varepsilon_k - \Sigma(i\omega_n, k)}$$ \hspace{1cm} (10.2a)$$

$$\Sigma(i\omega_n, k) = -U^2 T \sum_{\Omega_n} \int_{k_1} G(i\Omega_n, k_1) \Pi(i\omega_n + i\Omega_n, k + k_1)$$ \hspace{1cm} (10.2b)$$

$$\Pi(i\Omega_n, q) = T \sum_{\omega_n'} \int_{k'} G(i\omega_n', k') G(i\omega_n' + i\Omega_n, k + q),$$
where $\int_k = \int d^d k/(2\pi)^d$ and $\varepsilon_k$ is the electron dispersion. These equations are reminiscent of the usual DMFT equations, but where the electron self-energy is allowed to be momentum dependent. As we discuss below, in the strong coupling limit, the momentum dependence becomes parametrically weaker compared to the frequency dependent renormalization, stemming from the local SYK physics (Chowdhury et al., 2018).

The above equations are difficult to solve analytically in general as a function of frequency and momenta; the full solution can be obtained numerically across the entire Brillouin zone. However, significant insights can be gained analytically by starting with a low energy guess for a self-consistent solution. Recall that in the limit where the sites are all decoupled, at energies $\omega \ll U$ for $H_1$ in Eq. (5.1a), the electron scaling dimension $\Delta = 1/4$. By simple power counting arguments, $H_{\text{kin}}$ is a relevant perturbation; as a result the power-law solution for the Green’s function obtained earlier can not survive down to the lowest energies and there will be a crossover to a regime dominated by $H_{\text{kin}}$ that can nevertheless be strongly renormalized due to interactions (Parcollet and Georges, 1999; Song et al., 2017).

At the lowest energies, we assume the self-energy to take a Fermi liquid form,

$$\Sigma(i\omega_n, k) = -i(Z^{-1} - 1)\omega_n + \Delta\varepsilon_k,$$  

where $Z$ is the quasiparticle residue and $\Delta\varepsilon_k$ is the renormalization associated with the dispersion, to be determined self-consistently. As a further simplification, zooming in on the near vicinity of the Fermi surface, we can parametrize $\Delta\varepsilon_k = (\Delta v_F) k$ where $\Delta v_F$ is the Fermi velocity renormalization and $k$ is measured relative to the Fermi surface. The self-consistency condition then reduces to,

$$Z^{-1} - 1 = \nu_0^2 U^2 Z$$

$$\frac{\Delta v_F}{v_F} \sim \nu_0^2 U^2 Z^2,$$

where $\nu_0$ is the bare density of states at the Fermi energy. In the strong-coupling limit $U \gg W$, where $W$ is the unrenormalized single-particle bandwidth, we immediately obtain $Z \sim 1/(i\nu_0 U)$ and $(\Delta v_F)/v_F \sim O(1)$. Thus the dominant self-energy renormalization in Eq. (10.3) is frequency dependent, with a much weaker momentum dependence. As a result, we also immediately infer the effective mass renormalization, $(m^*/m) = 1/Z$.

The ground state is thus a heavy Fermi liquid with a sharp Fermi surface at any strength of interaction. The above picture of a Fermi liquid breaks down as a function of increasing energies. Naively, one would expect this to occur for energies comparable to $W$; this is incorrect and the crossover instead occurs at a much reduced scale of $W^* \sim W^2/U$ which also serves as the renormalized bandwidth of the heavy Fermi liquid. Consider the coherent part of the Green’s function,

$$G(i\omega, k) = \frac{Z}{i\omega - Z\varepsilon_k + i\alpha v_F U|\omega|^2 \ln \left(\frac{W^*}{|\omega|}\right)\text{sgn}(\omega)},$$

where $\varepsilon_k = \varepsilon_k + \Delta\varepsilon_k$ and $\alpha \sim O(1)$ constant; the $\ln(\ldots)$ is specific to $d = 2$. After analytically continuing to real frequencies, the imaginary part of the self-energy in Eq. (10.5) becomes $\Sigma''(\omega) \sim \omega^2/W^*$, such that $\Sigma''(W^*) \sim W^*$. Thus, at energies approaching $W^*$, the scattering rate of the quasiparticles becomes comparable to the renormalized bandwidth. This is a sign that the quasiparticle picture and the sharp Fermi surface associated with the low energy Fermi liquid is breaking down.

We can instead approach the problem from higher energy scales. For $\omega \gg W^*$, it is appropriate to start from the solutions to Eqs. (10.2a) and (10.2b) in the decoupled limit and treat the hopping perturbatively (i.e. in powers of $\varepsilon_k$). In this limit, we reproduce the completely local form of the electron Green’s function obtained earlier in Eq. (5.3). The leading momentum dependence can be obtained in the strong-coupling regime by expanding in powers of $\varepsilon_k$,

$$G(i\omega, k) = \frac{i\text{sgn}(\omega)}{\sqrt{U|\omega|}} - B(\omega) \frac{\varepsilon_k}{U|\omega|},$$

where $B(\omega)$ is a frequency independent constant whose value depends on the sign of $\omega$ and descends from the spectral asymmetry discussed earlier in Sec. (V).
is an incoherent regime where the electronic quasiparticles are not well defined. Note that the momentum-dependent correction becomes comparable to the local term at $\omega \sim W^*$. The above description leads to a simple picture for the properties of the model in Eq. (10.1a) and (10.1b). At the lowest energy scales, the system is a heavy Fermi liquid with a sharp Fermi surface satisfying Luttinger’s theorem. All interaction induced corrections are predominantly frequency dependent, with a weak residual momentum dependence. The DMFT-like behavior is linked to the properties of the single SYK cluster. As a function of increasing energies, the quasiparticle scattering rate increases until they are no longer well defined; at scales approaching the renormalized bandwidth, $W^*$, the Fermi surface and the quasiparticles are completely destroyed. Starting from higher energies, $W^*$ also marks the crossover where the completely local picture of the decoupled SYK dots with perturbative spatial corrections breaks down and is accompanied by the incipient formation of a Fermi surface. Going beyond the large-$N$ results discussed here, the fate of the low-temperature phase can be vastly different (Altland et al., 2019a).

We note that if the model in Eq. (10.1a) and (10.1b) is defined with a random $t_{\mathbf{r}\mathbf{r}'}$ and uncorrelated $U_{ij;kl}$ at different sites (Song et al., 2017), the properties of the incoherent regime discussed above remain unchanged since the spatial correlations are completely local. The low energy disordered FL regime is similar in many aspects to the FL discussed above, but is notably different in the presence of the sharp Fermi surface. We return to some of the consequences of this subtle difference when we discuss transport in Sec. (X.C) below.

Finally, we note a model (Patel and Sachdev, 2019) in which the random interactions are restricted to be ‘resonant’: this has $W^* \to 0$, and the Planckian behavior holds down to zero temperature. The rationale for such a model is that the non-resonant interactions have already been absorbed in effective $t_{\mathbf{r}\mathbf{r}'}$ for the quasiparticles.

B. Marginal Fermi liquid and critical Fermi surface from incoherent ‘flavor’ fluctuations

Our theoretical discussion of the metallic non-Fermi liquids discussed in this review thus far have lacked any interesting spatial structure. Even for the lattice model considered in the previous section, the incoherent regime had no singular momentum-dependent features. However, it is possible to add additional electronic degrees of freedom to the model introduced in Eq. (10.1a), (10.1b) and engineer a critical Fermi surface — a sharp electronic Fermi surface without any low-energy electronic quasiparticles — over a wide range of energy scales. Interestingly, these additional electronic degrees of freedom realize a ‘marginal’ Fermi liquid, where the single particle lifetime, $\Gamma_{np} \sim \max(\omega, T)$ (Chowdhury et al., 2018; Patel et al., 2018b).

Consider an additional band of electrons, $d_{ri}$, defined on the sites of the same hyper-cubic lattice with orbital labels $i = 1, \ldots, N$, with a separately conserved density, $Q_d$. We are interested in Hamiltonians of the form,

$$H = H_c + H_d,$$

$$H_d = \sum_{\mathbf{k},i} \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}i} d_{\mathbf{k}i}^\dagger d_{\mathbf{k}i} + \frac{1}{N^{3/2}} \sum_{\mathbf{r}} \sum_{ijkl=1}^{N} V_{ij;kl} c_{\mathbf{r}i}^\dagger d_{\mathbf{r}j}^\dagger d_{\mathbf{r}k} c_{\mathbf{r}l},$$

where $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}$ is the dispersion for $d$-electrons (including the respective chemical potential) and $H_c$ continues to be defined by Eq. (10.1a) and (10.1b). The $V_{ij;kl}$ are assumed to be identical at every site, thereby preserving translational symmetry, and chosen from a Gaussian random distribution with $\langle V_{ij;kl} \rangle = 0$ and variance $\langle |V_{ij;kl}|^2 \rangle = V^2$. We are particularly interested in the regime where the bandwidth for $d$-electrons, $W_d$, far exceeds the $c$-electron bandwidth, $W$. The setup here is reminiscent of the periodic Anderson model for an itinerant ‘conduction’ electron band coupled to a strongly interacting, narrow band (Hewson, 1997), except that the interaction terms now are chosen to have a purely SYK form.

![Fig. 20](image-url) The melon graphs for the model in Eq. (10.7a) for the electron self-energies for (a) $c$, and (b) $d$ electrons, respectively. Solid black (red) lines denote fully dressed $c$ ($d$) Green’s functions. The dashed (dotted) line represents the disorder averaging associated with the interaction vertices, $\langle U_{ij;kl} \rangle$ ($\langle V_{ij;kl} \rangle$), respectively.

In the large-$N$ limit, only a set of coupled melon graphs survive for the Green’s function corresponding to
both $c$ and $d$ electrons (Fig. 20),

$$G(i\omega_n, k) = \frac{1}{i\omega_n - \epsilon_k - \Sigma(i\omega_n, k) - \Sigma'_d(i\omega_n, k)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (10.8a)

$$G_d(i\omega_n, k) = \frac{1}{i\omega_n - \epsilon_k - \Sigma_d(i\omega_n, k)},$$  \hspace{1cm} (10.8b)

$$\Sigma'_d(i\omega_n, k) = \frac{-V^2 T}{i\omega_n - \epsilon_k - \Sigma_d(i\omega_n, k)},$$  \hspace{1cm} (10.8c)

$$= -V^2 T \sum_{i\Omega_n} \int_{k_1} G(i\Omega_n, k_1) \Pi_d(i\omega_n + i\Omega_n, k + k_1)$$

$$= V^2 T \sum_{i\Omega_n} \int_{k_1} G_d(i\Omega_n, k_1) \Pi(i\omega_n + i\Omega_n, k + k_1)$$

$$= V^2 T \sum_{i\omega_n} \int_{k'} G_d(i\omega_n', k') G_d(i\omega_n' + i\Omega_n, k' + q),$$  \hspace{1cm} (10.8d)

where $\Sigma(i\omega_n, k)$ and $\Pi(i\Omega_n, q)$ are as defined earlier in Eq. (10.2b).

Over an energy window $W^* \ll \omega$ (or $T \ll \min(W_d, U)$), when the $d$—electrons scatter off the incoherent fluctuations associated with the $c$—electrons, their self-energy is given by,

$$\Sigma_d(i\omega) \sim -i\omega \log \left( \frac{U}{|\omega|} \right),$$  \hspace{1cm} (10.9)

which has the celebrated marginal Fermi liquid (MFL) form. It is worth emphasizing here that the MFL regime in the present setup is generated self-consistently—even after including its feedback on the $c$—electrons—without having to postulate the existence of a featureless ‘bath’ (Varma et al., 1989).

In the translationally invariant setting discussed here, the $d$—electrons have a sharp Fermi surface. To make this precise, we can take the limit of $W^* \to 0$ at $T = 0$ and identify the location of the Fermi surface from the solution to $G_d^{-1}(0, k) = 0$. The critical Fermi surface satisfies Luttinger’s theorem, where its size is now determined solely by $Q_d$, i.e. the density of $c$—electrons is not included in the size as anticipated, and can therefore be characterized as ‘small’. The proof of Luttinger’s theorem for the critical Fermi surface follows the standard treatment in Fermi liquids (Abrikosov et al., 1963) and is based on the Luttinger-Ward functional. Interestingly, the two-particle correlators (e.g. in the density response) near the “$2k_F$” wavevector have a singular dependence as a function of energy. Note that the singular form of the self-energy in Eq. (10.9) is momentum independent and not tied to the near vicinity of the Fermi surface.

The above construction leads to a concrete realization of a ‘small’ critical Fermi surface with marginally defined excitations. However, the critical Fermi surface obtained here is necessarily accompanied by a finite extensive entropy extrapolated to $T \to 0$, which originates from the usual entropy associated with the incoherent regime of the local SYK islands of $c$—electrons. In Sec. XI below, we will discuss a different class of models where the critical Fermi surface is ‘large’ (i.e. the size is determined by the total electronic density) and can arise without an extensive entropy in the $T \to 0$ limit.

### C. Thermodynamics and Transport

For the single-band model in Eq. (10.1a) - (10.1b), the Fermi liquid at $T \ll W^*$ has an entropy density, $s \sim \gamma_{FL}T$, where $\gamma_{FL} \propto m^* \sim 1/W^*$. In the incoherent regime for $T \gg W^*$, the entropy density is given by that of a single SYK dot (Eq. 5.53) with weak perturbative corrections of order $(W/U)^2$; the extrapolated entropy in the limit of $T \to 0$ from this regime is finite (Georges et al., 2001), but the excess entropy is relieved at $T \sim W^*$ across the crossover into the Fermi liquid (Song et al., 2017). At $T \gg W^*$, electrical transport occurs as a result of the (perturbative) electron hops between SYK dots. Starting from Kubo formula for the conductivity and given the completely local form of the single-electron Green’s functions, the current-current correlation function reduces simply to a convolution of two spectral functions, much like standard computations of transport within DMFT. This leads to

$$\sigma(\omega, T) = \frac{Ne^2}{h} \frac{W^*}{T} F(\frac{\omega}{T}),$$  \hspace{1cm} (10.10)

where $F(\ldots)$ is a universal scaling function of $\omega/T$. This immediately leads to a bad metal $T$—linear resistivity (and scattering rate) with values that can far exceed $\rho_{Q} = h/ne^2$ over a range of temperatures, $W^* \ll T \ll U$. In the Fermi liquid regime at $T \ll W^*$, the resistivity crosses over into a conventional regime with $\rho = BT^2$ as long as the Fermi surface is large enough and electron-electron umklapp scattering is allowed. Interestingly, the coefficient ($B$) of the $T^2$ term satisfies the ‘Kadowaki-Woods’ scaling (Kadowaki and Woods, 1986), as can be verified simply by demanding that there is a smooth crossover at $T \sim W^*$ between the two different metallic regimes. We note that the ‘resonant’ model (Patel and Sachdev, 2019) has $W^* = 0$, and it exhibits strange metal linear $T$ resistivity with values well below $\rho_{Q}$.

In the MFL regime of the two-band model introduced in Eq. (10.7a), the critical Fermi surface associated with the $d$—electrons gives rise to a singular specific heat, $C \sim T\ln(1/T)$, at low temperatures, in addition to the usual contribution from the SYK dot associated with the $c$—electrons. Once again, given the local form of the single-particle self-energy in the MFL regime, transport simplifies considerably leading to a $T$—linear resistivity.
associated with the $d$–electrons,

$$
\rho_d(T) \sim \frac{\hbar}{Ne^2} \left( \frac{V^2}{W_d^2T} \right) T.
$$

(10.11)

In the translationally invariant setting of Eq. (10.7a), the finite resistivity arises as a result of momentum relaxation to the ‘bath’ formed by the local $c$ electrons at every site (Chowdhury et al., 2018).

We end this section by noting that the extrapolated zero-temperature entropy from the strange metal regime of the cuprates vanishes (Loram et al., 1994), unlike the residual extensive entropy in the limit of $T \to 0$ associated with the models considered here displaying SYK-like critical correlations at large $N$. There are a number of other materials displaying nFL behavior over intermediate energy scales where the extrapolated entropy is also known to be extensive and finite but relieved below a certain low-temperature coherence scale (Allen et al., 1996; Brühlwiler et al., 2006).

### D. Superconductivity

Conventional Fermi-liquid metals, even with purely repulsive interactions (i.e. in the absence of phonon-mediated attraction), are unstable to superconductivity at extremely low temperatures. This ‘Kohn-Luttinger’ mechanism (Kohn and Luttinger, 1965) relies on an effective attraction that is generated in a non-$s$-wave angular momentum channel at higher orders in the interaction strength. An analogous general statement can not be made about the non-Fermi liquid metals introduced in this article and their pairing instabilities, if any, have to be analyzed on an individual basis.

The models introduced in this section so far do not have any pairing instabilities. By extending these models to include spinful fermions, a number of routes have been used to generate attraction via pair-hopping interactions (Patel et al., 2018a; Wu et al., 2018), a random Yukawa interaction to a bosonic field (e.g., phonon) (Esterlis and Schmalian, 2019; Wang, 2020) and introducing additional correlations between the interaction matrix-elements, $U_{ij;kt}$ (Chowdhury and Berg, 2020). At large–$N$, all of these models have a mean-field like transition to superconductivity where Eliashberg theory becomes asymptotically exact. However, the instability is not tied to the usual ‘Cooper-logarithm’ (Abrikosov et al., 1963) associated with an underlying Fermi surface and the ratio of gap-magnitude to transition temperature is enhanced above the standard mean-field value. When supplemented by an on-site attractive Hubbard interaction, the above models display a fluctuation regime resembling a ‘pseudogap’ (Wang et al., 2020) before the superconducting transition. Certain tensor models defined in terms of real fermions (Kim et al., 2019) have also been studied and found to exhibit spontaneous symmetry breaking analogous to pairing.

Intrinsic superconducting instabilities of the non-Fermi liquids introduced above and their analogy with the Kohn-Luttinger mechanism can be seen by introducing a spin-label, $\sigma = \uparrow, \downarrow$, modifying Eq. (10.1b) to

$$
H_{\text{int}} \to \frac{1}{4N^{3/2}} \sum_{\sigma = \uparrow, \downarrow} \sum_{ij;kt=1}^N U_{ij;kt} c_{\sigma i}^\dagger c_{\sigma j}^\dagger c_{\sigma k} c_{\sigma t},
$$

(10.12)

and including additional correlations between the interaction matrix elements as: $U_{ij;kt} = \pm U_{ik;jt}$. The physics is qualitatively different depending on the $\pm$ sign here, as can be seen most directly by writing down the Bethe-Salpeter equation (Fig. 21) for the intra-orbital, spin-singlet vertex in the pairing channel: $\Phi_{\ell}(r - r') \equiv \langle \sigma \sigma \sigma | c_{\ell \sigma} c_{r \ell \sigma} \rangle$.

![FIG. 21 The Bethe-Salpeter equation for the intra-orbital pairing vertex, $\Phi$, in the large–$N$ limit.](image)

At zero external center-of-mass momentum, the linearized equation for $\Phi_{\ell}$ becomes,

$$
\Phi_{\ell}(\omega, k) = \Phi_{\ell} + U^2 T \sum_{\Omega} \int_{q} \Phi_{\ell}(\Omega, q) G(\omega, q) G(-\omega, -q) \Pi(i\omega - i\Omega, -k - q),
$$

(10.13)

where $G(\omega, q)$ and $\Pi(i\omega, q)$ are as introduced earlier in Eqs. 10.2a, 10.2b. Importantly, introducing the additional spin label and the matrix correlations, $U_{ij;kt} = \pm U_{ik;jt}$, does not change the asymptotic nature of the single-electron Green’s functions, but can lead to preemptive instabilities to superconductivity depending on ‘$\pm$’ sign (Chowdhury and Berg, 2020). For the model with $U_{ij;kt} = U_{ik;jt}$, the eigenvalue problem in Eq. 10.13 has a non-trivial solution with a superconducting $T_c \sim U$. Importantly, superconductivity preempts the crossover into the heavy Fermi liquid and arises at the level of a single site due to effectively attractive interactions that are generated at $O(U^2)$; the superfluid stiffness is nevertheless
finite and given by \( N W^* \gg T_c \). On the other hand, for the model with \( U_{ij,k\ell} = -U_{k\ell,ij} \), there is no instability at the level of a single-site and while the pairing susceptibility is enhanced approaching \( T \sim W^* \) from above, the non-Fermi liquid is stable against pairing. However, across the crossover into the heavy Fermi liquid regime, the momentum dependence in \( \Pi(\mathbf{q}) \) can drive a pairing transition, much like the Kohn-Luttinger mechanism, but where \( T_c \) is now set by the only relevant scale in the problem, \( W^* \). Similar generalizations can also be constructed for the two-band models in Sec. X.B, to analyze the intrinsic pairing instabilities of the marginal Fermi liquid with a critical Fermi surface (Chowdhury and Berg, 2020).

**XI. FERMI SURFACES COUPLED TO GAPLESS BOSONS**

This section will turn to a different, and extensively studied, approach to non-Fermi liquids in clean metals. We begin with a Fermi liquid with a well-defined Fermi surface and long-lived quasiparticles, and examine the breakdown of quasiparticles due to scattering from a gapless boson: this gapless boson can either be associated with an order parameter near a symmetry-breaking transition, or an emergent excitation associated with fractionalization. Note, however, that the Fermi surface remains sharp in momentum space, even though the quasiparticles are not well defined and the spectra are broad in energy space: this realizes a ‘critical Fermi surface’, as discussed in Section II.B.

We will follow a recent approach (Esterlis et al., 2021b) which incorporates insights from the SYK model to provide a systematic treatment of such critical Fermi surfaces, and also exposes similarities to SYK non-Fermi liquids. As we will describe below, there are difficulties in applying conventional large \( N \) methods to the critical Fermi surface problem. The new approach shows that required large \( N \) limit can be obtained provided we allow random coupling constants, as in the SYK model. In the present situation, the couplings can be spatially uniform, so that translational invariance is maintained (Aldape et al., 2020; Esterlis et al., 2021b). Despite the presence of random couplings, many properties self-average in the large \( N \) limit, just as in the SYK model. The central idea is that in a given finite \( N \) system, with a fixed set of coupling constants, there is an RG flow to a common universal low energy theory. Assuming the existence of such a theory, we attempt to access the universal low energy physics simply by averaging over couplings. Upon carrying out this procedure, we find that only certain averages over the couplings matter, and the values of these averages cancel out in the low energy theory, thus supporting the existence of a universal theory. We note that the idea of simplification realized by an average over similar strongly-coupled theories is also playing an important role in recent investigations in quantum gravity, and averages over random matrices or conformal field theories yield systematic large \( N \) holographic realizations of the path integral of simple theories of gravity (Afkhami-Jeddi et al., 2020; Chen et al., 2021; Cotler and Jensen, 2020; Datta et al., 2021; Engelhardt et al., 2020; Maloney and Witten, 2020; Pérez and Troncoso, 2020; Saad et al., 2019; Stanford and Witten, 2019).

To begin, it is useful to recast some results of Fermi liquid theory using a ‘patch formalism’, which is designed to simplify the treatment of long wavelength fluctuations near the Fermi surface. We summarize this treatment in Appendix E. Such a formalism is not traditionally used in textbook treatments of Fermi liquid theory as one of their key features, namely the low energy excitations near the Fermi surface actually involve short wavelength fluctuations, associated with particle-hole excitations at large momenta but low energy. However, the breakdown of quasiparticles in the critical Fermi surface of interest to us here is dominated by long wavelength fluctuations; the structure of a ‘non-Fermi’ liquid without quasiparticle excitations becomes clear in the patch theory.

We will now consider a specific model of a critical Fermi surface — fermions coupled to an emergent \( U(1) \) gauge field. As outlined in Sec. II.B, such a theory arises in a number of different physical contexts, including spin liquid Mott insulators with a gapless Fermi surface of spinons (Altshuler et al., 1994; Lee, 1989; Polchinski, 1994) and the compressible quantum Hall state in the half-filled Landau level with a gapless Fermi surface of composite fermions (Halperin et al., 1993). The formalism is also easily extended to a number of other examples involving the onset of broken symmetries, identified by order parameters with vanishing lattice momentum, in a metal (e.g. Ising-nematic order in a Fermi liquid (Metlitski and Sachdev, 2010)).

**A. Fermi surface coupled to a dynamical \( U(1) \) gauge field**

Consider a non-zero density of fermions coupled to an emergent \( U(1) \) gauge field, \( A_\mu \). In the presence of a Fermi surface, the longitudinal components of \( A_\mu \) are screened just as in an ordinary metal with Coulomb interactions. However, there is no screening in the transverse sector, and so we shall focus only on the transverse spatial components \( A_{x,y} \). We can schematically write the theory by generalizing the action for the Fermi liquid (see Eq. (E1)) to

\[
S_{cA} = \int d\tau \left[ \int \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} \epsilon_{ka} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} + \varepsilon (-i \nabla - A) \right) c_{ka} + \frac{N K}{2} \int d^2 x \left( \nabla \times A \right)^2 \right].
\]  (11.1)
We have not included an explicit time derivative term for $A$ because it will turn to be subdominant to the frequency dependence induced by the Fermi surface. The co-efficient of the Maxwell term $(\nabla \times A)^2$ is determined by short distance physics, and we have included a prefactor of $N$ for future convenience; the gauge-coupling is denoted $K^{-1}$. We have restricted our considerations to spatial dimension $d = 2$, where the frequency dependence for the self-energy will be most singular, and is also the dimension of most physical applications.

Let us now proceed with a perturbative, but self-consistent, analysis of $S_{\phi A}$ along the lines of the patch theory analysis of Fermi liquid theory in Appendix E. We focus on the vicinity of the point $k_0$ on the Fermi surface, as in Fig. 24. For the gauge field $A$, it turns out we need only include components of their momenta which are tangent to the Fermi surface. This is closely connected to the $1/|q_0|$ dependence of the fermion polarizability in Eq. (E15): a similar polarizability appears in the self energy of the gauge field, and this divergence makes the tangential gauge field fluctuations much more singular. Recalling that we are focusing only on transverse gauge field fluctuations, we may replace the gauge singular. Recalling that we are focusing only on transverse gauge field fluctuations, we may replace the gauge scalar field by a single scalar field $\phi$. Hence, the fermion Green’s function is expressed in the usual way, as the location where $G^{-1}(k, \omega, T) = 0$, the result Eq. (11.5) will likely drop out of gauge-invariant observables. In any case, there are no issues at $T = 0$, in which case we find the non-Fermi liquid self energy $\Sigma(\omega) \sim \omega^{2/3}$. At $T > 0$, the result Eq. (11.5) obeys a scaling form similar to that for the SYK model in Eq. (5.27) (Lee, 1989)

$$\Sigma(k, \omega, T) \propto T^{2/3} \Phi \left( \frac{\hbar \omega}{k_B T} \right).$$

(11.6)

This is much larger than the bare $\omega$ term in the inverse Green’s function, and leads to the absence of a quasiparticle pole at the Fermi surface, where the latter is defined as the location where $G^{-1}(k, \omega = 0, T = 0) = 0$.

1. Large $N$ limit

As we have emphasized earlier, our apparent perturbative computations of the fermion Green’s function are actually fully self-consistent in the self energies of both the gauge field and the fermion. In this sense, the equations have a structure very similar to that of the SYK model. So as in the SYK model, we ask if there is a systematic large $N$ approach in which these results can be obtained as the saddle point of an action? This will ensure that the solutions are locally stable against all perturbations, determine conditions under which superconducting or other instabilities could exist, and also allow a systematic treatment of corrections.

Despite numerous attempts, a systematic and satisfactory treatment that relies only on a naive large-$N$ expansion has been lacking in the literature. The difficult is apparent from an examination of Eqs. (11.4) and (11.5). In a model with $N$ fermion flavors, the singular self energy in Eq. (11.5) has a prefactor of $1/N$, and so is formally smaller than the bare dispersion, $v_F k_0 + k k_0^2 / 2$. However, the self energy has to be matched with the bare dispersion to obtain the physical excitations, and so a power of $N$ is unavoidable in the dispersion of the renormalized excitations. This implies that higher order Feynman graphs can be enhanced by powers of $N$ not associated with the symmetry factors of the graphs, leading to a breakdown of the $1/N$ expansion; this is indeed what happens (Lee, 2009). Various workarounds have been attempted, but none have been entirely successful.

As we noted earlier, recent studies (Aldape et al., 2020; Esterlis et al., 2021b) have shown that a systematic large-$N$ theory of the critical Fermi surface can be obtained in a theory with couplings which are random in flavor space, but are translationally invariant. We now show how such a theory leads to a $G$-$\Sigma$ formulation for the critical Fermi surface. We start with the theory Eq. (11.2), promoting the scalar $\phi$ to now acquire $N$ indices, $\phi_n$, and introduce...
a set of random couplings $g_{abc}$; we also set $v_F = 1, \kappa = 2$. Then the required theory is (Esterlis et al., 2021b)

$$S_{\psi \phi} = \int d\tau dx dy \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} - i \frac{\partial}{\partial x} - \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} \right) \right] \psi_a + K \left( \frac{\partial \phi_a}{\partial y} \right)^2 - \frac{g_{abc}}{N} \phi_a \psi^\dagger_b \psi_c \right]. \quad (11.7)$$

The key new feature is the set of independent random complex Yukawa couplings, $g_{abc}$, which have zero mean and variance $g^2$.

We can now proceed just as in the SYK model: we obtain a theory for Green’s functions which are bilocal in both space and time. Using the spacetime co-ordinate $X \equiv (\tau, x, y)$, we can write the averaged partition function

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\psi \phi} = \int D\Sigma(X_1, X_2) D\Sigma(X_1, X_2) D\Sigma(X_1, X_2) \times D\Pi(Y_1, Y_2) \exp \left[ -NI(G, \Sigma, D, \Pi) \right]. \quad (11.8)$$

The $G, \Sigma, D$-Pi action is now

$$I(G, \Sigma, D, \Pi) = \frac{g^2}{2} \text{Tr} (G \cdot [G D]) - \text{Tr}(G \cdot \Sigma) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(D \cdot \Pi) \quad (11.9)$$

$$- \ln \det \left[ \left( \partial_{x_1} - i \partial_{x_2} - \partial_{y_1}^2 \right) \delta(X_1 - X_2) + \Sigma(X_1, X_2) \right] + \frac{1}{2} \ln \det \left[ \left( -K \partial_{y_2}^2 \right) \delta(X_1 - X_2) - \Pi(X_1, X_2) \right].$$

where we have introduced notation analogous to Eq. (5.57),

$$\text{Tr}(f \cdot g) \equiv \int dX_1 dX_2 f(X_2, X_1) g(X_1, X_2). \quad (11.10)$$

Note the crucial pre-factor of $N$ before $I$ in the path-integral.

The large $N$ saddle point equations of this action are precisely the self-consistent equations we have already solved above, apart from differences in factors of $N$. Assuming all saddle point Green’s functions depend only upon spacetime differences, we can write them as

$$G(k, i\omega_n) = \frac{1}{i\omega_n - k_x - k_y - \Sigma(k, i\omega_n)}$$

$$D(q, i\Omega_n) = \frac{1}{K q^2 - \Pi(q, i\Omega_n)}$$

$$\Sigma(X) = g^2 D(X) G(X)$$

$$\Pi(X) = -g^2 G(X) G(-X). \quad (11.11)$$

From the previous analysis, we can write down the solution to these equations as

$$\Pi(q, i\Omega_n) = -\frac{g^2}{8\pi} \frac{\Omega_n}{|\eta_q|} \quad (11.12)$$

$$\Sigma(k, i\omega_n) = -2i \frac{g^{4/3} \Omega_n^{1/3}}{K^{1/3}} \frac{T}{3\sqrt{3}} \sum_{\Omega_n \neq 0} \text{sgn}(\omega_n + \Omega_n) \frac{1}{|\Omega_n|^{1/3}}. \quad (11.13)$$

Crucially, note that $N$ does not appear in these saddle point equations, unlike that in the self energy in Eq. (11.5).

2. Luttinger’s theorem

Despite the absence of a quasiparticle pole, Luttinger’s theorem still applies to the critical Fermi surface with essentially no modifications. On general grounds we can expect that at $T = 0$, $\text{Im} G^{-1}(k, i\eta) = 0$ at all $k$, where $\eta$ is a positive infinitesimal, and this is certainly obeyed by Eq. (11.5). Then, as in Fermi liquid theory, the Fermi surface is defined by $\text{Re} G^{-1}(k_F, i\eta) = 0$, with particle-like excitations for $\text{Re} G^{-1}(k_F, i\eta) < 0$, and hole-like excitations for $\text{Re} G^{-1}(k_F, i\eta) > 0$. Then, we proceed as in Section V.B, and decompose the expression for the charge density per flavor index $Q$ into 2 terms:

$$Q = \int_{k} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \text{Re} G(k, i\omega) e^{-i\omega - \eta} = I_1 + I_2$$

$$I_1 = i \int_{k} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \frac{d}{d\omega} \text{Re} \left[ G(k, i\omega) \right] e^{-i\omega - \eta} \quad (11.13)$$

$$I_2 = -i \int_{k} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \text{Re} \left[ G(k, i\omega) \frac{d}{d\omega} \Sigma(k, i\omega) e^{-i\omega - \eta} \right],$$

where $\int_{k} \equiv \int d^dk/(2\pi)^d$. We evaluate $I_1$ as in Eq. (5.17), and obtain

$$I_1 = i \lim_{\eta \to 0} \int_{k} \int_{-\infty}^{0} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \frac{d}{d\omega} \ln \left[ G^{-1}(k, \omega + i\eta) \right]$$

$$= -\frac{1}{\pi} \lim_{\eta \to 0} \int_{k} \left[ \arg G^{-1}(k, i\eta) - \arg G^{-1}(k, -\infty + i\eta) \right]. \quad (11.14)$$

The momentum integrand evaluates to $-\pi$ for $\text{Re} G^{-1}(k_F, i\eta) > 0$, and 0 otherwise, and hence $I_1$ evaluates the momentum space volume enclosed by the Fermi surface, divided by $(2\pi)^d$.

It now remains to establish that $I_2 = 0$ for the critical Fermi surface case, unlike the SYK model results in Section V.B. The self energy of the critical Fermi surface in Eq. (11.6) is singular at $\omega = 0$, just like the self energy of the SYK model in Eq. (5.27). So we might worry that there is an anomalous contribution to $I_2$ from the singularity at $\omega = 0$, as there was in Section V.B. However, that is not the case here because the singularity of the Green’s function is much weaker as a result of its momentum dependence; now the low-energy Green’s function is

$$G^{-1}(k, \omega) = -v_F k_x - \frac{\kappa}{2} k_y^2 - \Sigma(\omega), \quad (11.15)$$

and this diverges at $\omega = 0$ only on the Fermi surface $v_F k_x + \kappa k_y^2/2 = 0$. Indeed, with this form, the local density of states is a constant at the Fermi level. Consequently, there is no anomaly at $T = 0$, and $I_2 = 0$ from the Luttinger-Ward functional analysis. Incidentally, we
note that the Luttinger-Ward functional in the large $N$ limit is just the first term in the action $I$ in Eq. (11.9), similar to the SYK model.

To complete this discussion, we add a few remarks on the structure of the Luttinger-Ward functional, and its connection to global U(1) symmetries (Coleman et al., 2005b; Powell et al., 2005). Consider the general case where we are multiple Green’s functions (of bosons or fermions) $G_\alpha(k, \omega)$. Let the $\alpha$'th particle have a charge $q_\alpha$ under a global U(1) symmetry. Then for each such U(1) symmetry, the Luttinger-Ward functional will obey the identity

$$
\Phi_{\text{LW}}[G_\alpha(k, \omega)] = \Phi_{\text{LW}}[G_\alpha(k, \omega + q_\alpha \Omega)] \tag{11.16}
$$

Here, we are regarding $\Phi_{\text{LW}}$ as functional of two distinct sets of functions $f_{1,2,\alpha}(\omega_\alpha)$, with $f_{1,\alpha}(\omega_\alpha) \equiv G_\alpha(k, \omega_\alpha + q_\alpha \Omega)$ and $f_{2,\alpha}(\omega) \equiv G_\alpha(k, \omega_\alpha)$, and $\Phi_{\text{LW}}$ evaluates to the same value for these two sets of functions. Expanding Eq. (11.16) to first order in $\Omega$, and integrating by parts, we establish the corresponding $I_2 = 0$.

3. Thermodynamics

The grand potential can be computed by evaluating Eq. (11.8) for the saddle point in Eq. (11.12). Such a computation (Halperin et al., 1993) shows that the entropy density

$$
s \sim T^{2/3}. \tag{11.17}
$$

It is useful to give a scaling interpretation of Eq. (11.17) (Eberlein et al., 2016). In a critical theory with dynamic critical exponent $z$ in spatial dimension $d$, we expect $s \sim T^{d/z}$. In our case, we have fermionic excitation which disperse as $\omega \sim k_z^{3/2}$, and so we identify $z = 3/2$. In this case, Eq. (11.17) matches with the scaling expectations in $d = 1$ dimension. Evidently, the free energy is similar to that of chiral fermions dispersing normal to the Fermi surface, and the integral along $k_y$ only determines the prefactor in Eq. (11.17) which is related to the area of the Fermi surface. In scaling terms, it is conventional to denote such a dimensional transmutation in terms of a violation of hyperscaling exponent $\theta$, so that the entropy density scales as $T^{(d-\theta)/z}$. Then Eq. (11.17) corresponds to $d = 2$, $\theta = 1$, $z = 3/2$.

Let us now extend these scaling argument to a finite system volume $V$, and compare the behavior to that of the random matrix model in Section IV.B, and of the SYK model in Section V.F.2. Following these earlier treatments, we deal with extensive quantities, such as the total entropy $S = sV$. We expect the scaling $V \sim T^{d/z}$, and so $S \sim T^{d/z}$. Similarly we, have for the energy density $e \sim T s \sim T^{(d+z-\theta)/z}$, and the total energy $E = eV \sim T^{(d+z-\theta)/z}$. Collecting these scaling forms, we express the total entropy $S$ as a function of the total energy $E$, and the volume $V$, as in Sections IV.B and V.F.2

$$
S(E) = V^{\theta/d} \Phi_S \left( E V^{(z-\theta)/d} \right), \tag{11.18}
$$

where $\Phi_S(y)$ is a scaling function. As $V \to \infty$, we expect the relationship to only involve intensive quantities, and so $S/V$ should only be a function of $E/V$. This is achieved if

$$
\Phi_S(y \to \infty) \sim y^{(d-\theta)/(d-\theta+z)}. \tag{11.19}
$$

The scaling results Eqs. (11.18) and (11.19) are easily seen to be obeyed by both the random matrix and SYK models. For these models, we identify the system size $N$ with the volume $V$, but we cannot accord much meaning to the values of the exponents because there is no true sense of space. For the random matrix model, the result Eq. (4.18) is of the form Eq. (11.19) with the scaling function $\Phi_S(y) \sim \sqrt{y}$ and $\theta = d - z$. For the SYK model, the result Eq. (5.81) corresponds to $\Phi_S(y) = c_1 + c_2 \sqrt{y}$, for some constants $c_1, c_2$, and the exponents $\theta = d, z = 0$.

For the critical Fermi surface, the important open question is the behavior of $\Phi_S(y \to 0)$. A reasonable conjecture is that $\Phi_S(y \to 0)$ is a non-zero constant. In this case, the total entropy in the $T \to 0$ or $E \to 0$ limit is $S \sim T^{\theta/d} = \sqrt{V}$. Note that this is different from the behavior of the entropy for the critical Fermi surface state obtained earlier in Sec. X.B. In other words, the entropy of the critical Fermi surface here is sub-extensive at low energies, a behavior intermediate between the random matrix (which has $S(E \to 0) \sim V^0$) and SYK (which has $S(E \to 0) \sim V$) models. The many-body density of states would then behave as $N(E \to 0) \sim \exp(\sqrt{V})$, although as in all systems $N(E) \sim \exp(V)$ when $E$ is extensive.

4. Transport

We now couple the fermions on the critical Fermi surface to an external U(1) gauge field (distinct from $A$ in Eq. (11.1)), and discuss the structure of the associated conductivity. The highly singular self-energy in Eq. (11.6) suggests that there will be strong scattering of charge carriers, and hence a low $T$ resistivity which is larger than the $T^2$ resistivity of a Fermi liquid. Indeed, it was argued in an early work (Lee, 1989) that the resistivity $\sim T^{4/3}$; this is weaker than $\Sigma \sim T^{2/3}$, because of the $(\cos(\theta))$ factor in the transport scattering time, for scattering by an angle $\theta$, and the dominance of forward scattering.

However, this argument ignores the strong constraints placed by momentum conservation (Eberlein et al., 2016; Hartnoll et al., 2016, 2014; Maslov et al., 2011) in a theory of critical fluctuations which is described by a translationally invariant continuum field theory, such as
Eq. (11.2). If we set up an initial state at \( t = 0 \) with a non-zero current, such a state necessarily has a non-zero momentum, which will remain the same for \( t > 0 \). The current will decay to a non-zero value which maximizes the entropy subject to the constraint of a non-zero momentum. This non-zero current as \( t \to \infty \) implies that the d.c. conductivity is actually infinite. These considerations are similar to those of ‘phonon drag’ (Peierls, 1930, 1932) leading to the absence of resistivity from electron-phonon scattering. In practice, phonon drag is observed only in very clean samples (Hicks et al., 2012), because otherwise the phonons rapidly lose their momentum to impurities. But the electron-phonon coupling is weak, allowing for phonon-impurity interactions before there are multiple electron-phonon interactions. In contrast, for the critical Fermi surface, the fermion-boson coupling is essentially infinite because it leads to the breakdown of electronic quasiparticles. So the critical Fermi surface must be studied in the limit of strong drag, with vanishing d.c. resistivity in the critical theory.

Mechanisms extrinsic to the theory in Eq. (11.2) are required to relax the current and obtain a finite d.c. conductivity. In a system with strong interactions, such processes are most conveniently addressed by a ‘memory matrix’ approach that has been reviewed elsewhere (Hartnoll et al., 2016); this approach also has close connections to holographic approaches (Lucas, 2015; Lucas and Sachdev, 2015). Various mechanisms have been considered (Else and Senthil, 2020; Hartnoll et al., 2014; Lee, 2020; Maslov et al., 2011; Wang and Berg, 2019) involving disorder or umklapp processes, and these do lead to a singular resistivity at low \( T \).

The behavior of the conductivity, \( \sigma \) at non-zero frequency \( \omega \) is more universal, where the effects of total momentum conservation are not so singular. In a quantum-critical system, the naive scaling dimension is \( d - 2 \), and so we expect \( \sigma(\omega) \sim \omega^{(d-2)/z} \), which is frequency independent in \( d = 2 \). However, we have noted violation of hyperscaling in the free energy in Section XI.A.3, and a first guess would be that there is a violation of hyperscaling in the conductivity, with \( \sigma(\omega) \sim \omega^{(d-2-\theta)/z} \). Using the values of \( \theta \) and \( z \), we can write the scaling form (Eberlein et al., 2016)

\[
\text{Re } \sigma(\omega \neq 0, T) = \omega^{-2/3} \Phi_\sigma \left( \frac{\omega}{T} \right) \tag{11.20}
\]

This scaling form is consistent with explicit computations of the frequency dependent conductivity (Eberlein et al., 2016; Kim et al., 1994; Kim et al., 1995).

In a system with momentum conservation, we can sensibly define the shear viscosity, \( \eta_\tau \), in the continuum field theory. This has been computed (Eberlein et al., 2017b), and its hyperscaling violation however turns out to be different from that of the entropy and the conductivity. The ratio \( \eta_\tau/s \), where \( s \) is the entropy density, diverges as \( T^{-2/5} \), a result that is consistent with the minimum viscosity conjecture (Kovtun et al., 2005).

5. Pairing instability

As written in Eq. (11.1), the gauge field mediates a repulsive interaction between antipodal points on the Fermi surface, and so does not lead to a Cooper pairing instability. However, we can consider closely related problems, either with critical order parameters or with fermions with multiple gauge charges, where the interactions between antipodal fermions is attractive (Metlitski et al., 2015). In the context of the large \( N \) limit of Section XI.A.1, the equations determining the pairing instability, remarkably, reduce (Esterlis et al., 2021b) to precisely those associated with pairing instabilities of the SYK model (Kim et al., 2019; Klebanov et al., 2020). The pairing vertex \( \Phi(i\Omega) \) obeys the integral equation (Esterlis et al., 2021b)

\[
E \Phi(i\Omega) = \frac{\mathcal{K}}{3} \int \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \frac{2\pi \Phi(\omega)}{|\omega|^{2/3}|\omega - \Omega|^{1/3}} , \tag{11.21}
\]

where \( \omega, \Omega \) are imaginary frequencies, and \( \mathcal{K} \) is a dimensionless number that can be determined from the structure of the critical Fermi surface problem being considered. Given the scale-invariant structure of Eq. (11.21), we are search for solutions with

\[
\Phi(i\Omega) = \frac{1}{|\Omega|^\alpha} , \tag{11.22}
\]

and the physical solutions are those values of \( \alpha \) for which the eigenvalue \( E = 1 \). The pairing problem so defined appeared in the context of SYK models (Kim et al., 2019; Klebanov et al., 2020), but also in earlier studies of quantum critical pairing of Fermi surfaces (Chubukov and Abanov, 2021; Moon and Chubukov, 2010). A solution with a real \( 0 < \alpha < 1/3 \) implies that the critical Fermi surface state is stable, and the value of \( \alpha \) determines the exponent of critical correlations of the pairing operator (Esterlis et al., 2021b). Otherwise, there are solutions with complex \( \alpha \), and these imply a pairing instability. The critical temperature towards pairing is determined by solving a generalization Eq. (11.21) at non-zero \( T \), and examining the \( T \) at which the complex solution first appears.

B. Adding disorder

Given the rather singular transport properties of the critical Fermi surface described in Section XI.A.4, it would be valuable to have the corresponding large \( N \) analysis of a model which includes the self-consistent influence of weak disorder on the critical Fermi surface, beyond the perturbative analysis provided by the memory function approach (Hartnoll et al., 2016). The sim-
plest disorder we can add to Eq. (11.7) is potential disorder, similar in spirit to that in Section IV: this is a term $v_{ab}(x)v_{bd}^*(x)/\sqrt{N}$, in which $v_{ab}$ is random matrix uncorrelated at different points in space, so that

$$v_{ab}(x)v_{cd}^*(x') = v^2\delta_{ac}\delta_{bd}\delta(x-x').$$  \hfill (11.23)

This potential leads to an additional term in the large $N$ action in Eq. (11.9). The solution of the corresponding saddle point equations will be reported on in forthcoming work (Estelris et al., 2021a).

Instead, we consider here a different type of disorder (without that in Eq. (11.23)) whose saddle point equations turn out to be easier to solve. The Yukawa couplings $g_{abc}$ in Eq. (11.7) are taken to be random functions of space, in addition to being random functions in flavor space (Estelris et al., 2021b). So now we have the second moment

$$\overline{g_{abc}(x)g_{ab'}c'(x')} = g^2\delta^4(x-x')\delta_{aa'}\delta_{bb'}\delta_{cc'}.$$  \hfill (11.24)

The theory with the disorder in Eq. (11.24) alone can be analyzed in a manner which parallels Section XI.A.1. The structure of the saddle point equations is very similar to those of the spatially uniform model, with the main difference being that momentum is not conserved, and the computation of the critical theory, then the transport scattering time is

$$\Sigma(i\omega) \sim -\text{sign}(\omega)|\omega|\ln(\Lambda/|\omega|),$$  \hfill (11.25)

where $\Lambda$ is cutoff scale. This is ‘marginal Fermi liquid’ behavior (Varma et al., 1989).

Given the presence of spatial disorder, the total momentum is not conserved, and the computation of the conductivity, $\sigma$, in straightforward in the large $N$ of the model with the disorder in Eq. (11.24). It is found (Estelris et al., 2021b) that $\sigma$ obeys the Drude formula, with

$$\sigma = \frac{ne^2\tau_{tr}^*}{m^*}$$  \hfill (11.26)

where the effective mass $m^*$ is computed from the self energy Eq. (11.25) in a Fermi liquid state proximate to the critical theory. Then the transport scattering time is found to be (Estelris et al., 2021b)

$$\frac{1}{\tau_{tr}^*} \approx \frac{\pi}{2} \frac{k_BT}{h}$$  \hfill (11.27)

along with factors which are slow logarithmic functions of temperature. This is remarkably similar to observations of Planckian dissipation in strange metals (Cao et al., 2020; Grierson et al., 2021; Jaoni et al., 2021; Legros et al., 2019; Nakajima et al., 2020) even though the connection of the present models to the underlying microscopic models of these materials, if any, remains unclear.

XII. CONNECTIONS TO QUANTUM GRAVITY

We saw in Section V.F that the finite $N$ fluctuations of the SYK model were described by a path integral over time reparameterizations. This suggests a connection to the theory of quantum gravity. By the holographic principle (‘t Hooft, 2001), we expect the gravity theory to acquire an emergent spatial direction. As the SYK path integral is over $0+1$ dimensions, we anticipate a connection to quantum gravity in $1+1$ dimensions. However, Einstein gravity in $1+1$ dimensions has no dynamical modes, and so cannot serve as a holographic partner to the SYK model. As we will see below in Section XII.B, the appropriate theory is a class of $1+1$ dimensional theories known as Jackiw-Teitelboim (JT) gravity, which has an additional scalar field $\Phi$. This gravity theory is most naturally obtained by dimensional reduction, from a charged black hole of Einstein gravity in $d+2$ spacetime dimensions ($d \geq 2$). Such a black hole has a $\text{AdS}_2 \times S^d$ near-horizon geometry; the JT gravity theory resides on $\text{AdS}_2$, and fluctuations of $\Phi$ represent the quantum fluctuations in the radius of $S^d$. The connection between the SYK model and charged black holes was first noted (Sachdev, 2010) by matching characteristics of the $N = \infty$ SYK theory and the classical gravity solution of charged black holes in Einstein gravity. Later, it was pointed out (Kitaev, 2015) that the connection was stronger, and also held for a low energy sector of the fluctuations.

In this section, we will begin by reviewing the quantum theory of charged black holes in $d+2$ spacetime dimensions. We will then discuss its low temperature limit, and show, by the dimensional reduction outlined above, that this yields a version of JT gravity, which is in turn equivalent to the Schwarzian theory of the SYK model in Section V.F.

There is another, and closely related, connection between SYK models and black holes that we briefly mention now. Our discussion above (and below) focuses on the equilibrium thermodynamic properties. In dynamic properties, SYK models are characterized by Planckian time dynamics (Sachdev, 1999), as we discussed in Section V.C; other metallic systems also have a similar dynamics, in theory and experiment, as noted in Sections XI.B and III.B. Remarkably, Einstein gravity also displays Planckian time dynamics for black holes responding to external perturbations. This is evident in computations of the damping rate of black hole quasi-normal modes (Hod, 2007; Vishveshwara, 1970): this purely classical gravity rate is $\sim \hbar/(k_BT_H)$ where $T_H$ is the Hawking temperature of the black hole ($\hbar$ in the Planckian time formula cancels with the $\hbar$ in $T_H$). A recent analysis of LIGO data (Carullo et al., 2021) has confirmed this remarkable universality in black hole quasi-normal modes.

The quantum fluctuations of gravity and electromag-
netism are formally defined by a path integral

\[ Z_{EM} = \int DgDA \exp(-I_{EM}) \]  

(12.1)

where \( I_{EM} \) is the Einstein-Maxwell action (that we will write down below), and the path integral is over the metric \( g \) of spacetime, and the electromagnetic vector potential \( A \). It is almost certainly true that the expression Eq. (12.1) does not make sense as it stands, because of numerous ultraviolet divergencies and gauge-fixing issues. Nevertheless, it turns out to be possible to make sense of Eq. (12.1) in certain limits. For black hole saddle-point solutions of \( I_{EM} \), it was shown (Gibbons and Hawking, 1977) that the evaluation of \( I_{EM} \) at the saddle point in a Euclidean geometry, with a thermal circle of circumference \( \hbar/k_B T \) along the temporal direction, gave a consistent description of the quantum thermodynamics of black holes. It is only via the \( \hbar \) dependence of this circumstance that Planck's constant thermodynamics of black holes. It is only via the \( \hbar \) dependence of this circumstance that Planck's constant appears in such computations: there is no \( \hbar \) in \( I_{EM} \), the classical Einstein-Maxwell action. We will set \( \hbar = k_B = 1 \) in the remainder of our discussion.

We will review the Gibbons-Hawking description of a charged black hole (Chamblin et al., 1999) in Section XII.A. Remarkably, there turn out to be precise quantitative connections to the thermodynamics of the SYK model (Sachdev, 2010, 2015).

Fluctuation corrections to the Gibbons-Hawking thermodynamics were computed only recently in the low \( T \) limit for charged holes. In principle, these corrections could have been computed decades ago, but the computations were undertaken only after the connection to the SYK model showed the route that was needed. These computations are reviewed in Section XII.B, which shows that the low energy theory of charged black holes reduces to an effective theory which is identical to the theory in Eqs. (5.58) and (5.60) obtained for the SYK model of complex fermions.

Section XII.C briefly surveys rapid recent developments on coupled SYK models in and out of equilibrium, which are holographically realized by solitons/instantons known as ‘wormholes’.

Section XII.D discusses approaches to the theory of strange metals using the AdS/CFT correspondence of supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory (Hartnoll et al., 2016), and connects these to the SYK model by placing the Yang-Mills theory on a finite sphere.

A. Charged black holes: Einstein-Maxwell theory

We consider the case of spherical black holes in \( d + 2 \) spacetime dimensions; we assume \( d \geq 2 \) in all of the following discussions of quantum gravity. The Einstein-Maxwell theory has the Euclidean action

\[ I_{EM} = \int d^{d+2}x \sqrt{-g} \left[ \frac{1}{2\kappa^2} \left( \mathcal{R}_{d+2} + \frac{d(d+1)}{L^2} \right) \right. \\
\left. + \frac{1}{4g_F^2} F^2 \right], \]  

(12.2)

where \( \kappa^2 = 8\pi G_N \) is the gravitational constant, \( \mathcal{R}_{d+2} \) is the Ricci scalar, \( F = dA \) is the electromagnetic flux, and \( g_F \) is a U(1) gauge coupling constant. We have also included a negative cosmological constant term so that the spacetime at asymptotic infinity is AdS\(_{d+2} \) with radius \( L \); the limit of large \( L \) can be taken at the end to obtain Minkowski spacetime at infinity.

We now describe the spherical charged black hole saddle-point of \( I_{EM} \). There is a 2 parameter family of such solutions, which we will specify by the temperature \( T \), and the chemical potential \( \mu \). All other properties of the black hole saddle point are determined by \( T, \mu \), and the constants of nature in \( I_{EM} \); this includes the spacetime metric, the U(1) gauge field, the radius of the horizon, \( r_0 \), the total charge in the black hole \( Q \), and the black hole entropy \( S \).

The classical Einstein-Maxwell equations yield the following expression for the metric expressed in terms of imaginary time \( \tau \), radial co-ordinate \( r \), and \( d\Omega^2_d \) the metric of the \( d \)-sphere: (Chamblin et al., 1999)

\[ ds^2 = V(r)d\tau^2 + r^2d\Omega^2_d + \frac{dr^2}{V(r)} \]  

(12.3)

where

\[ V(r) = 1 + \frac{r^2}{L^2} + \frac{\Theta^2}{r_0^{2d-2}} - \frac{M}{r^{d-1}}. \]  

(12.4)

As \( r \to \infty \), the metric in Eq. (12.3) is AdS\(_{d+2} \). The radius of the horizon is determined by \( V(r_0) = 0 \), which we write as

\[ M = r_0^{d-2} \left( 1 + \frac{r_0^2}{L^2} + \frac{\Theta^2}{r_0^{2d-2}} \right). \]  

(12.5)

The gauge field solution has the form

\[ A = i\mu \left( 1 - \frac{r_0^{d-1}}{r^{d-1}} \right) d\tau. \]  

(12.6)

The value of the gauge field at the AdS boundary defines the chemical potential \( \mu \), provided \( r_0 \) is the horizon. The Einstein-Maxwell equations applied to Eqs. (12.3) and (12.6) also yield the condition

\[ \Theta = \sqrt{\frac{(d-1)\kappa\pi r_0^{d-2}}{d g_F^2 \mu}}. \]  

(12.7)

So far, our analysis has been entirely classical. As stated above, quantum mechanics enters the picture only
by the condition that the solution in Eq. (12.3) yield a spacetime which is periodic as a function of $\tau$ with period $1/T$. We can impose periodicity as a function of $\tau$ by fiat, but have to ensure that there is no singularity at the horizon $r_0$ where $V(r_0) = 0$. Let us change radial co-ordinates to $y$, where $r = r_0 + y^2$. Then near the horizon, the $(r, \tau)$ components of Eq. (12.3) become

$$ds^2 = \frac{4}{V'(r_0)} \left[ \frac{(V'(r_0))^2}{4} y^2 d\tau^2 + dy^2 \right].$$

(12.8)

Now notice that the expression in the square brackets is precisely the metric of the flat plane in polar co-ordinates, with radial co-ordinate $y$ and angular co-ordinate $\theta = V'(r_0)\tau/2$. For there to be no real singularity at the origin of polar co-ordinates, only a co-ordinate singularity, we must have periodicity in $\theta$ with period $2\pi$.

Matching this with the period $1/T$ in $\tau$, we determine the Hawking temperature of the black hole

$$4\pi T = V'(r_0).$$

(12.9)

The Eqs. (12.5, 12.7, 12.9) determine all the parameters, $\Theta, M, r_0$ in terms of $\mu$ and $T$. So we have specified a black hole solution in terms of the independent thermodynamic parameters $\mu$ and $T$.

We now quote the free energy and entropy of this black hole, obtained by the evaluation of $I_{EM}$ at the saddle-point above. The action has to be supplemented by a Gibbons-Hawking boundary term which is required to obtain the classical Einstein-Maxwell equations as saddle-point equations of $I_{EM}$. Such an evaluation of $I_{EM}$ yields the grand potential (Chamblin et al., 1999)

$$\Omega(T, \mu) = \frac{s_d[r_0(T, \mu)]^{d-1}}{2\kappa^2} \left( 1 - \frac{[r_0(T, \mu)]^2}{L^2} \right) - \frac{s_d(d-1)\mu^2[r_0(T, \mu)]^{d-1}}{2dg_F^2},$$

(12.10)

where $s_d \equiv 2\pi^{(d+1)/2}\Gamma((d+1)/2)$ is the area of $S_d$ with unit radius. We can evaluate the entropy by taking the temperature derivative of $\Omega$ to obtain

$$S(T, \mu) = \frac{2\pi s_d}{\kappa^2} [r_0(T, \mu)]^d,$$

(12.11)

which is precisely the expression expected from Hawking’s celebrated result $A/(4G_N)$: $A = s_d r_0^{d-1}$ is the area of the horizon. Similarly, the total charge is obtained by taking the $\mu$ derivative of $\Omega$

$$Q(T, \mu) = \frac{s_d(d-1)\mu^d[r_0(T, \mu)]^{d-1}}{g_F^2},$$

(12.12)

and this expression can also be obtained from Gauss’s law evaluated as $r \to \infty$.

We will now take the $T \to 0$ limit of all the results above, while keeping the charge $Q$ fixed. Then the horizon radius $r_0 \to R_h$, where

$$Q = \frac{s_d R_h^{d-1} \sqrt{d[(d+1)R_h^2 + (d-1)L^2]}}{\kappa g_F^2}.$$  

(12.13)

We are interested in the structure of the metric near the horizon at $T = 0$. For this purpose, we transform to near-horizon co-ordinates, by changing the radial co-ordinate from $r$ to the co-ordinate $\zeta$, where

$$r = R_h + \frac{R_h^2}{\zeta};$$

(12.14)

in these co-ordinates, the $T = 0$ horizon is at $\zeta = \infty$; see Fig. 22. We chose the length scale $R_2$ to be

$$R_2 = \frac{LR_h}{\sqrt{d(d+1)R_h^2 + (d-1)^2L^2}}.$$  

(12.15)

Then, as $T \to 0$, the metric Eq. (12.3) for $\zeta \gg 1/R_h$ (region (A) in Fig. 22) becomes

$$ds^2 = \frac{R_h^2}{\zeta^2} \left[ d\tau^2 + d\zeta^2 \right] + R_h^2 d\Omega_a^2.$$  

(12.16)

The metric on the $(\tau, \zeta)$ space-time is $AdS_2$, and the complete metric is $AdS_2 \times S^d$. In the same co-ordinate system, the U(1) gauge field becomes

$$A = i\frac{\zeta}{\bar{\kappa}} d\tau,$$

(12.17)

where the dimensionless prefactor

$$\mathcal{E} = \frac{g_FR_hL}{{\kappa d[(d+1)R_h^2 + (d-1)L^2]}},$$

(12.18)

is a measure of the electric field on the horizon of the black hole. We have chosen the same symbol $\mathcal{E}$ for this prefactor as that appearing in characterizing the particle-hole asymmetry of the SYK model in Eqs. (5.9) and (5.26). This is not arbitrary (Sachdev, 2010, 2015): computations (Faulkner et al., 2011b) of the Green’s function of a fermion moving in the background specified by
Eqs. (12.16) and (12.17) remarkably yields precisely the result in Eq. (5.26).

Let us now turn to a computation of the entropy, where we find remarkable connections to the SYK model. We write \( S(T \to 0) = S \), and then from Eq. (12.11)

\[
S = \frac{2\pi s_d}{\kappa^2} R_h^d
\]

(12.19)

So we obtain a non-vanishing entropy in the zero temperature limit, similar to the SYK model (Sachdev, 2015). Furthermore, by eliminating \( R_h \) between Eqs. (12.13) and (12.19), and using Eq. (12.18), we find

\[
\frac{\partial S}{\partial T} \bigg|_{T \to 0} = 2\pi \mathcal{E}
\]

(12.20)

which is exactly the relation Eq. (5.36) obtained for the SYK model (Sachdev, 2015). We can also compute the dependence of \( \mathcal{E} \) on \( T \), and verify that the Maxwell relation Eq. (5.35) is satisfied. Furthermore, \( T \) dependence of entropy computed from Eq. (12.19) is linear in \( T \) at low \( T \) and fixed \( Q \)

\[
S(T \to 0, Q) = S + \gamma T,
\]

(12.21)

where

\[
\gamma = \frac{4\pi^2 ds_d P_h^2 \rho_l^{d-1}}{\kappa^2}.
\]

(12.22)

This is as is in the SYK model in Eq. (5.53), where the value of \( \gamma \) was related to the co-efficient of a Schwarzian action, and we will do the same for the charged black hole in Section XII.B.

The appearance of the fundamental relation Eq. (12.20) of the SYK model in the theory of a charged black hole may appear like a co-incidence here, but it is not. In fact, Eq. (12.20) is a general property of black holes with \( \text{AdS}_2 \) horizons, and follows from careful consideration of their symmetries (Sen, 2005, 2008). These symmetries are similar to those described in Appendix B for the SYK model, which were exploited in Section V.D to obtain Eq. (5.36) (Davison et al., 2017; Gu et al., 2020; Sachdev, 2015).

1. Charged black branes

This section briefly notes the limit of the above spherical solution when the black hole becomes an infinite, flat, charged ‘black brane’, with a near-horizon geometry of \( \text{AdS}_2 \times \mathbb{R}^d \), in contrast to the near-horizon \( \text{AdS}_2 \times S^d \) considered so far. These results will be helpful in Section XII.D where we discuss the connection to the \( \text{AdS}/\text{CFT} \) correspondence. This limit is obtained by taking \( R_h \gg L \) in our results so far. We introduce the charge and entropy densities:

\[
\mathcal{Q} = \frac{Q}{s_d L^d}, \quad \mathcal{S} = \frac{S}{s_d L^d}
\]

(12.23)

Then we have from Eq. (12.13)

\[
\mathcal{Q} = \sqrt{\frac{d(d+1)}{L \kappa g_E}} \left( \frac{R_h}{L} \right)^d.
\]

(12.24)

Similarly, the \( T \to 0 \) entropy in Eq. (12.21) becomes the Hawking entropy density

\[
\mathcal{S}(T \to 0, \mathcal{Q}) = 2\pi \left( \frac{R_h}{L} \right)^d \left[ 1 + \frac{2\pi L^2 T}{(d+1)R_h} \right].
\]

(12.25)

These results for the densities correspond exactly to those obtained earlier (Faulkner et al., 2011b) from direct solution of the flat black-brane geometry.

B. Charged black holes: quantum fluctuations

This section will examine quantum fluctuations about the saddle-point solution of Einstein-Maxwell theory described in Section XII.A. Remarkably, in the ‘extremal’ limit \( T \ll 1/R_h \), the theory of these fluctuations coincides with those of the theory Eqs. (5.58) and (5.60) obtained from the SYK model (Gaikwad et al., 2020; Heydeman et al., 2020; Iliesiu and Turicci, 2020; Moitra et al., 2019; Nayak et al., 2018; Sachdev, 2019). Below, we will outline how this theory may be obtained starting from Eq. (12.1). A more detailed review of these fluctuation computations has been presented elsewhere (Sachdev, 2019), and here we shall highlight the key steps:

1. Reduce the \( d + 2 \) spacetime dimensional theory in \( I_{EM} \) to a \( 1+1 \) dimensional theory \( I_{EM,2} \) by taking all fields dependent only upon the radial coordinate \( r \) and imaginary time \( \tau \).

2. Take the low energy limit of \( I_{EM,2} \) by mapping it to a near-horizon theory, \( I_{JT} \), in a \( 1+1 \) dimensional spacetime with a boundary: so we “integrate out” region (C) in Fig. 22, and obtain an effective theory in regions (A) and (B). In these regions, the near-horizon \( \text{AdS}_2 \) saddle point in Eqs. (12.16) and (12.17) is an exact saddle point of \( I_{JT} \). Outside the boundary, there is a crossover to the full solution of \( I_{EM} \) in Eqs. (12.3) and (12.6) to region (C) where spacetime does not factorize into \( \text{AdS}_2 \times S^d \).

3. Compute fluctuations about the \( \text{AdS}_2 \) saddle point of \( I_{JT} \). Einstein gravity is 1+1 dimensions has no graviton, and is ‘pure gauge’. In the JT-gravity theory with boundary, there is a remnant degree of freedom which is a boundary graviton. The action for this boundary graviton is precisely the Schwarzian theory in Eqs. (5.58) and (5.60).

We outline these steps for the \( \text{AdS}_2 \times S^d \) sector in the following subsections. The electromagnetic sector produces the action for the phase field \( \phi \) in the Schwarzian theory, as is discussed elsewhere (Sachdev, 2019).
1. Dimensional reduction from $d + 2$ to $1 + 1$.

We write the $(d + 2)$-dimensional metric $g$ of $I_{EM}$ in Eq. (12.2) in terms of a two-dimensional metric $h$ and a scalar field $\Phi$ (Davison et al., 2017; Nayak et al., 2018):

$$ds^2 = \frac{d\zeta^2}{\Omega^2} + \Phi^2 \, d\Omega^2_d. \quad (12.26)$$

Both $h$ and $\Phi$, and the gauge field $A$, are allowed to be general functions of the two-dimensional co-ordinates $\zeta$ and $\tau$ (recall Eq. (12.14) for the definition of the radial co-ordinate $\zeta$). Note that the scalar field $\Phi$ represents radial fluctuations in the size of the black hole. Then Eq. (12.2) and an associated Gibbons-Hawking boundary term reduce to ($x \equiv (\tau, \zeta)$)

$$I_{EM,2} = \int d^2 x \sqrt{h} \left[ -\frac{s_d}{2\kappa^2} \Phi^d R_2 + U(\Phi) + \frac{Z(\Phi)}{4g_F^2} F^2 \right]$$

$$I_{GH} = -\frac{s_d}{\kappa^2} \int \partial x \sqrt{h_b} \Phi^d K_1$$

$$\quad (12.27)$$

along with an additional term not displayed which cancels in $I_{EM,2} + I_{GH}$ (Nayak et al., 2018). The Gibbons-Hawking term is to be evaluated at the boundary at $\zeta \to 0$ or $r \to \infty$. Here $R_2$ is the two-dimensional Ricci scalar, the second integral is over a one-dimensional boundary with metric $h_b$ and extrinsic curvature $K_1$. The explicit forms of the potentials $U(\Phi)$ and $Z(\Phi)$ are,

$$U(\Phi) = -\frac{s_d}{2\kappa^2} \left( \frac{d(d-1)}{\Phi} + \frac{d(d+1)\Phi}{L^2} \right)$$

$$Z(\Phi) = \frac{s_d}{\kappa^2} \Phi^{d-1}. \quad (12.28)$$

The 1+1 dimensional action in Eqs. (12.27,12.28) has exactly the same saddle point solution as that of the $d + 2$ dimensional action in Eq. (12.2). The 1+1 dimensional theory $I_{EM,2}$ now involves a metric $h$ and a scalar field $\Phi$, and in terms of the new variables, the solution is given by matching Eq. (12.3) with the ansatz in Eq. (12.27). In this manner, it is easy to see that the exact solution for the scalar field is

$$\Phi(\zeta) = R_h + \frac{R_2^2}{\zeta}. \quad (12.29)$$

2. JT gravity in the near-horizon limit

Note that the $T = 0$ horizon is obtained as $\zeta \to \infty$, and the factorization of the metric to $\text{AdS}_2 \times S^d$ fails for $\zeta \lesssim R_h$. So we reduce the theory to the near-horizon spatial region $\zeta > \zeta_b$, with

$$R_h \ll \zeta_b \ll \frac{1}{T} \quad (12.30)$$

which applies in regions (A) and (B) of Fig. 22. The low energy limit of the 1+1 dimensional theory of step 1 to

$\zeta > \zeta_b$ was argued (Almheiri and Polchinski, 2015; Maldacena et al., 2016b) to be the JT gravity theory (Jackiw, 1985; Teitelboim, 1983) of a metric $h$ and a scalar field $\Phi$ given by

$$I_{JT} = \int d^2 x \sqrt{h} \left[ -\frac{s_d}{2\kappa^2} \Phi \left( R_2 + \frac{2}{H_b} \right) \right]$$

$$I_{GH} = -\frac{s_d}{\kappa^2} \int \partial x \sqrt{h_b} \Phi K_1$$

along with boundary conditions of the form

$$h_{\tau\tau}(\zeta \to \zeta_b) = \frac{H_b}{\zeta^2}$$

$$\Phi_{1}(\zeta \to \zeta_b) = \frac{\Phi_b}{\zeta}. \quad (12.32)$$

This theory depends upon 2 constants, $H_b$ and $\Phi_b$, and we can obtain their values by matching to the solution for the two-dimensional metric $h$ and scalar field $\Phi$ obtained in Step 1, which was valid at all $\zeta$. The boundary condition on $h_{\tau\tau}$ is obtained by comparing Eq. (12.26) with Eq. (12.16), and using the leading term in Eq. (12.29) for large $\zeta$ we obtain:

$$H_b = R_2^2 R_{h_b}^{d-1}. \quad (12.33)$$

The subleading term in Eq. (12.29) contributes to the co-efficient of $R_2$ in Eqs. (12.27) and (12.31), which from Eq. (12.29) yields

$$\lim_{\zeta \to \infty} [\Phi(\zeta)]^{d} = R_h^d + \Phi_{1}(\zeta) + \ldots \quad (12.34)$$

Then the boundary value of $\Phi_{1}$ in Eq. (12.32) determines

$$\Phi_{b} = dR_{h_b}^{d-1}R_2^2. \quad (12.35)$$

Now, the saddle point solution of the JT gravity theory in Eqs. (12.31) and (12.32) co-incides with the metric Eq. (12.16), which we now generalize to $T > 0$:

$$ds^2 = \frac{R_2^2 R_{h_b}^{d-1}}{\zeta^2} \left[ (1 - 4\pi^2 T^2 \zeta^2) d\tau^2 + \frac{d\zeta^2}{1 - 4\pi^2 T^2 \zeta^2} \right]$$

$$\Phi_{1}(\zeta) = \frac{\Phi_b}{\zeta}. \quad (12.36)$$

Note that the boundary form of $\Phi_{1}$ in Eq. (12.32) holds for all $\zeta$ in the regime of validity of the JT theory, a result also evident from Eq. (12.34). The horizon is at $\zeta = 1/(2\pi T)$, and it can be verified that the analog of Eq. (12.9) for the Hawking temperature is satisfied here.

3. From JT gravity to the Schwarzian

We address fluctuations about the saddle-point solution Eq. (12.36) of the JT gravity theory defined by Eqs. (12.31) and (12.32). The effective theory now has a
simple enough form that these fluctuations can be evaluated reliably (Maldacena et al., 2016b). Given the triviality of Einstein gravity in 1+1 dimensions, it is not surprising that the only dynamical degree of freedom in JT gravity is a time reparameterization along the boundary $\tau \rightarrow f(\tau)$. To ensure that the bulk metric obeys the boundary condition Eq. (12.32), we also have to make the spatial co-ordinate $\zeta$ a function of $\tau$, so we map $(\tau, \zeta) \rightarrow (f(\tau), \zeta(\tau))$. Then the boundary metric induced by Eq. (12.36) equals the value in Eq. (12.32) provided $\zeta(\tau)$ is related to $f(\tau)$ by

$$
\zeta(\tau) = \zeta_b f'(\tau) + \zeta_b \left( \frac{f''(\tau)}{2f'(\tau)} - 2\pi^2 T^2 [f'(\tau)]^3 \right) + O(\zeta_b^3). 
$$

Finally, we evaluate $I_{GH}$ in Eq. (12.31) along this boundary curve (the bulk contribution $I_{JT}$ vanishes from equation of motion of $\Phi_1$, which is $R_2 + 2/H_b = 0$). In this manner we obtain the action (Maldacena et al., 2016b; Sachdev, 2019)

$$
I_{\text{eff}}[f] = -\frac{s_d \Phi_b}{\kappa^2} \int_0^{1/T} d\tau \left\{ f(\tau), \tau \right\} + 2\pi^2 T^2 [f'(\tau)]^2 \right) 
$$

Notice that the arbitrary value of $\zeta_b$ has cancelled out, and this is an important consistency check on our steps. Remarkably, we have obtained the Schwarzian action, found earlier for the SYK model. Here, its presence is a consequence of the SL(2,R) symmetry of pure AdS$_2$ discussed in Appendix C, which require that the action vanish for $f(\tau)$ which are isometries of AdS$_2$. The action for other $f(\tau)$ appears from the ‘boundary graviton’ (Maldacena et al., 2016b) obtained by embedding of AdS$_2$ in the $d + 2$ dimensional geometry of a charged black hole.

Comparing the action Eq. (12.38) with the action for the SYK model in Eq. (5.60), we obtain from the coefficient of the Schwarzian (ignoring the $N$ prefactor in Eq. (5.60))

$$
\gamma = \frac{4\pi^2 s_d \Phi_b}{\kappa^2}. 
$$

After using the value of $\Phi_b$ in Eq. (12.35), we find that this value of $\gamma$ is in precise agreement with the value in Eq. (12.22), which was computed the $T$ dependence of the entropy in Eq. (12.11) for the full $d + 2$ dimensional theory. So the $\gamma$ co-efficients of both charged black holes and the SYK model (in Eq. (5.53)) are given by the coefficient of the Schwarzian effective action.

Finally, we can combine the Schwarzian fluctuation contribution to the entropy in Eq. (5.77) with leading Bekenstein-Hawking entropy in Eqs. (12.11,12.15,12.21,12.22) to obtain the universal, leading, low $T$ form of the entropy of charged black holes in asymptotically Minkowski space ($L \gg R_h$) (Ilieiu and Turiaci, 2020; Sachdev, 2019)

$$
S(T) = \frac{A_0}{4G} \left[ 1 + \frac{2\pi d}{(d-1)^2} \left( \frac{A_0}{s_d} \right)^{1/d} \left( \frac{T_H}{T} \right) \right] - \frac{3}{2} \ln \left( \frac{U}{T} \right), 
$$

where $A_0 = s_d R_h^d$ is the horizon area at $T = 0$, and the factor is square brackets accounts for the change in the horizon area with increasing $T$ at fixed $Q$. The non-universal energy scale $U$ is now presumably a Planck scale energy, but the 3/2 co-efficient of the logarithm is independent of the nature of the high energy cutoff. The Schwarzian fluctuation correction becomes of order the Bekenstein-Hawking term only at an exponentially low temperature $T \sim U \exp(-A_0/(6G))$, when the theory breaks down, and the discrete level spacing of the black hole has to be accounted for.

As in Section V.F.2, the logarithmic correction to the entropy in (12.40) translates to the density of many-body states in Eq. (5.79). We note that this density of states is very different from that obtained in supersymmetric SYK models and black hole solutions of string theory (Fu et al., 2017; Heydeman et al., 2020): the latter have an exponentially large exact degeneracy of ground states with multiplicity $\sim \exp(A_0/(4G))$, and a gap $\sim 1/A_0^{1/d}$ to the first excited state. The generic non-supersymmetric situation with an exponentially small level spacing down to the ground state is illustrated in Fig. 5.

C. Wormholes

We have so far considered a single SYK model in thermal equilibrium, and argued that it is equivalent to a charged black hole, also in thermal equilibrium. The past few years have seen very rapid developments on the theory of more complex configurations of SYK models and black holes, including remarkable progress in resolving Hawking’s quantum information paradox on evaporating black holes. A common thread in these developments have been ‘wormholes’, which are the analogs of solitons or instanton tunneling events in quantum gravity.

Consider a pair of identical coupled SYK models, i.e. a ‘homonuclear diatomic SYK-molecule’, with Hamiltonian(Sahoo et al., 2020)

$$
H = \sum_{ij,kt} U_{ij,kt} \sum_{a=1,2} c_{ia}^\dagger c_{ja} c_{ka} c_{ta} - \mu \sum_{i,a} c_{ia}^\dagger c_{ia} + \sum_i \kappa (c_{i1}^\dagger c_{i2} + c_{i2}^\dagger c_{i1}). 
$$

Here $a = 1, 2$ labels the two SYK-atoms, and $\kappa$ is the tunneling amplitude between them. Notice that the random interactions $U_{ij,kt}$ are the same on both SYK-atoms. This 2-atom model is clearly similar to the lattices of SYK-atoms considered in Section X.A. At half-filling,
this model can acquire a gapped ground state, when the fermions occupy only the lower energy ‘bonding’ orbitals which are eigenstates of the $\kappa$ term. Holographically, this gapped state corresponds to an eternal wormhole between 2 black holes with $\text{AdS}_2$ horizons, as has been discussed in many recent works (Gao and Jafferis, 2021; García-Garcia et al., 2019; Maldacena and Qi, 2018; Nikolaenko et al., 2021; Plügge et al., 2020; Sahoo et al., 2020; Zhang, 2021; Zhou et al., 2021; Zhou and Zhang, 2020).

Next consider a single Majorana $q = 4$ SYK model of $N$ sites (as in Section V) coupled to a Majorana $q = 2$ random matrix model of $M$ sites (as in Section IV), with $M \gg N$; this is a ‘heteronuclear diatomic SYK-molecule’ with one atom much larger than the other, and is described by the Hamiltonian (Su et al., 2020)

$$H = \sum_{i<j<k<\ell} U_{ijkl}^{S} \psi_i \psi_j \psi_k \psi_\ell + i \sum_{a<b} U_{ab}^{E} \chi_a \chi_b + i \sum_{i,a} V_{ia} \psi_i \chi_a.$$  

(12.42)

Here $i, j, k, \ell = 1 \ldots N$ and $a, b = 1 \ldots M$. (The same considerations apply to models of complex fermions, but the authors chose Majorana fermions for simplicity.) The SYK-atom of $\psi$ fermions models a black hole, and we consider a situation in which it is in some pure excited state with energy $E$ at time $t = 0$. The $\chi$ free fermions represent the environment into which the black hole is going to radiate its energy, and so this setup models an evaporating black hole. At the initial time, the black hole is presumed to be decoupled from the environment, and so the entanglement entropy between the black hole and the environment vanishes. In the early stages of the evaporation, the energy $E$ will radiate out into the environment, and so the entanglement entropy will increase with time. However, we can also see that as $t \to \infty$, the energy $E$ will be essentially all absorbed by the environment (because $M \gg N$), and so the SYK model will be in a low energy state, with small entanglement with the environment. This time evolution of the entanglement is a model of the black hole Page curve (Su et al., 2020). In the holographic representation, the computation of such a Page curve involves spacetime wormholes, and we refer the reader to the literature for further details (Almheiri et al., 2020, 2021; Chen et al., 2021, 2020; Penington et al., 2019; Saad et al., 2019).

D. AdS/CFT correspondence

An alternative route to a connection between strange metals and quantum gravity uses the AdS/CFT correspondence of string theory. This is a correspondence between a conformal field theory (CFT) in flat $d$-dimensional space, and gravity on a $\text{AdS}_{d+2}$ spacetime (Maldacena, 1998; Witten, 1998). The canonical example in spatial dimension $d = 3$ is $\text{SU}(N_{YM})$ Yang-Mills gauge theory with $N = 4$ supersymmetry (Maldacena, 1998), and in spatial dimension $d = 2$ is $\text{SU}(N_{YM})$ Yang-Mills gauge theory with $N = 8$ supersymmetry (Aharony et al., 2008). Both theories are conformally invariant, and map to neutral $Q = 0$ black hole solutions of the action Eq. (12.2), with coupling constants

$$\kappa = \tilde{\kappa} N_{YM}^{-a} L^{d/2}, \quad g_F = \tilde{g}_F N_{YM}^{-a} L^{(d-2)/2},$$  

(12.43)

where $\tilde{\kappa}$ and $\tilde{g}_F$ are dimensionless constants of order unity, and $a = 1$ for $d = 3$, and $a = 3/4$ for $d = 2$.

To obtain a connection to strange metals, we have to ‘dope’ these CFTs i.e. we have to place them in a chemical potential coupling to a global $\text{U(1)}$ symmetry, which induces a conjugate charge density $N_{YM}^{2a} \mathcal{Q}_{YM}$ (Hartnoll et al., 2007). In the gravity theory, this doped CFT maps to the same charged black hole solutions we have considered for the SYK model, with the crucial difference that the relevant solutions are the flat black-brane solutions in Section XII.A.1, which describe the strange metals produced by doped supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory in infinite $d$-dimensional space in the limit of large $N_{YM}$. We note that the doping breaks the supersymmetry, so the low energy theory has no supersymmetry. The non-zero charge density in the supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory introduces a length scale of order $[\mathcal{Q}_{YM}]^{-1/d}$, and we are interested in physics at longer length scales. At these length scales, black brane solutions described in Section XII.A.1 have a $\text{AdS}_2 \times R^d$ geometry (Faulkner et al., 2011b). The doped Yang-Mills theories are described by continuum Lagrangians similar to the disorder-free models of non-Fermi liquids we considered in Section XI (Huijse and Sachdev, 2011; Huijse et al., 2012). The holographic flow of the doped Yang-Mills theory to a $\text{AdS}_2$ geometry is therefore significant evidence that the models of Section XI have an intermediate energy range over which their physics is described by the SYK-like local criticality (which we explored in Section VII for models of strong correlation with random exchange). While the SYK-critical state of Section VII is unstable to spin glass order at the lowest temperatures, there could be a crossover from local criticality to the momentum-dependent Fermi surface physics at the lowest energies for the models of Section XI. This is in contrast to the supersymmetric doped Yang-Mills theories, for which the $\text{AdS}_2$ geometry is stable down to zero temperature in the large $N_{YM}$ limit. We note another discussion (Iqbal et al., 2011, 2012) with a related point of view.

Some studies of the $\text{AdS}_2 \times R^d$ black brane solutions have focused on their response to additional probe fermions (Cubrovic et al., 2009, 2011; Faulkner et al., 2011a,b; Liu et al., 2011). In particular, it was shown that probe fermions in such a geometry acquired a Fermi surface and a self energy with some similarities to the
critical Fermi surface described in Section XI.A, with a self-energy which obeyed a scaling form similar to Eq. (11.6). But there were also significant differences from the microscopic critical Fermi surface theory of Section XI.A: (i) the self energy of the probe fermions had an exponent which varied with momentum across the Fermi surface; (ii) the size of the Fermi surface of the probe fermions was determined by the density of the probe fermions, and did not include the large density \( N_{2g}^{2g} \partial_{YM} \) of the Yang-Mills theory itself. The latter feature implies that this probe fermion black-brane density breaks the supersymmetry of the Yang-Mills theory, which are the temperature \( T \), the radius of the sphere \( R_{YM} \), and the charge density \( N_{YM}^{2g} \partial_{YM} \). Note that the coupling \( g \) becomes small in the limit of large \( N_{YM} \).

Let us examine the value of \( g_{Sch} \) in the limiting regime when the size of the sphere of the Yang-Mills theory is much larger than the size set by the charge density, \( R_{YM} \gg \partial_{YM}^{-1/d} \). Then we find \( R_h \gg L \) with

\[
R_h \sim R_{YM} \left[ \partial_{YM} R_{YM}^d \right]^{1/d}, \quad R_2 \sim R_{YM} \quad (12.47)
\]

so that

\[
\frac{1}{g_{Sch}} \sim N_{YM}^{2g} \left[ \partial_{YM} R_{YM}^d \right]^{(d-1)/d} R_{YM} T. \quad (12.48)
\]

We observe that \( g_{Sch}^2 \sim \left[ R_{YM} \right]^{-d} \) so the coupling becomes weak in the limit of a large sphere. Of course, as always, we have to maintain \( T \ll 1/R_h \) to apply the Schwarzian theory, so the maximum possible value of the Schwarzian coupling is

\[
\frac{1}{g_{Sch,max}} \sim N_{YM}^{2g} \left[ \partial_{YM} R_{YM}^d \right]^{(d-2)/d}. \quad (12.49)
\]

### E. Out-of-time-order correlations

The connections to quantum gravity have also introduced a new diagnostic—the out-of-time-order correlator—for detecting how quickly local perturbations become entangled with a macroscopic number of degrees of freedom in quantum many-body systems evolving under their own unitary dynamics. Out-of-time-order correlations (OTOCs) were studied a long time ago (Larkin and Ovchinnikov, 1969) as an approach to diagnosing the semiclassical consequences of classical chaos in a quantum system. The modern incarnation of OTOCs appeared (Sienker and Stanford, 2014) in the study of shock waves in black holes (Dray and ’t Hooft, 1985),
where they were proposed as a signature of intrinsically quantum chaos in a strongly interacting many-body system. Shenker and Stanford argued that any strongly interacting quantum system, which is holographically dual to a black hole described by a theory containing Einstein gravity, has an OTOC of local operators $V, W$ which has an exponential growth at early times:

$$\langle W(t)V(0)W(t)V(0) \rangle \sim \exp(\lambda_L t), \quad (12.50)$$

and the ‘Lyapunov growth rate exponent’ is given by

$$\lambda_L = 2\pi T. \quad (12.51)$$

This value of $\lambda_L$ is a direct consequence of Einstein gravity, and the circumference of the Euclidean temporal circle being equal to $\hbar/\kappa_B T$. This exponential growth was argued to be related to a rapid loss of memory of the initial perturbations with time, a characteristic also expected from the absence of quasiparticle excitations. It was subsequently argued (Maldacena et al., 2016a), without using any holographic connection, that the inequality $\lambda_L \leq 2\pi T$ must apply to all strongly interacting quantum systems. The bound has also been shown to follow directly from the structure of generic operators that satisfy the eigenstate thermalization hypothesis (Murthy et al., 2018a), with or without using any holographic connection, that the inequality $\lambda_L \leq 2\pi T$ must apply to all strongly interacting quantum systems.

The OTOC ideas have found a precise realization in the SYK model. For the model of Section V, we define the OTOC by

$$\text{OTOC}(t_1, t_3; t_2, t_4) = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i,j} \left\langle c_i^\dagger(t_1)c_j(t_3)c_i(t_2)c_j^\dagger(t_4) \right\rangle_{\text{conn.}}, \quad (12.52)$$

We examine the real time regime with $t_1 \approx t_2 \gg 1/T$, and $t_3 \approx t_4$, and define the ‘center of mass’ time separation

$$t = \frac{1}{2}(t_1 + t_2 - t_3 - t_4) \quad (12.53)$$

The OTOC of the SYK model can be computed by generalizing the expression Eq. (5.59) for Schwarzian fluctuations corrections from 2 point to 4 point correlators. In imaginary time, we have the 4-point correlator

$$\mathcal{F}(\tau_1, \tau_3; \tau_2, \tau_4) = \left\langle |f'(\tau_1) f'(\tau_2) f'(\tau_3) f'(\tau_4)|^{1/4} \right\rangle_{\text{conn.}} \times G_c(f(\tau_1) - f(\tau_2)) G_c(f(\tau_3) - f(\tau_4)) \quad (12.54)$$

where the average is over the Schwarzian path integral in Eq. (5.58) (we have omitted the unimportant fluctuations of $\phi$), and the conformal saddle-point Green’s function $G_c(\tau)$ is given by Eq. (5.25). After careful analytic continuation of this correlator to real times, it was found that in the time range $1 \lesssim T t \ll \ln N$ there is an exponential growth of the OTOC (Kitaev and Suh, 2017; Kitaev, 2015; Maldacena and Stanford, 2016)

$$\text{OTOC}(t_1, t_3; t_2, t_4) \propto \frac{1}{N} \exp(2\pi T t) \quad (12.55)$$

So the chaos inequality (Maldacena et al., 2016a) is saturated by the SYK model, which, not surprisingly, has the same chaos growth rate as systems holographically dual to Einstein gravity.

The spatial structure associated with the OTOC is equally interesting and directly diagnoses operator growth. In Eq. (12.50), if the operators are spatially separated, $W(t, r), V(0, 0)$, the OTOC exhibits a ballistic wavefront associated with the growing operators as a function of $(t - |r|/v_B)$. The ‘butterfly-velocity’, $v_B$, is an intrinsic speed associated with the quantum many-body state and can, in principle, be parametrically smaller than the microscopic scales associated with the Hamiltonian (Swingle and Chowdhury, 2017).

OTOCs have been studied in a variety of models, including the critical Fermi surface model of Section XI.A (Patel and Sachdev, 2017), the lattice models related to those of Section X (Gu and Kitaev, 2019; Gu et al., 2017a; Guo et al., 2019), disordered metals (Patel et al., 2017), and conformal field theories (Chowdhury and Swingle, 2017; Grozdanov et al., 2019; Kim et al., 2021; Stanford, 2016; Steinberg and Swingle, 2019), and all find a regime of exponential growth with a $\lambda_L$ that obeys the chaos bound, accompanied by a sharp ballistic wavefront. All of these settings involve a large–$N$ or a weak-coupling semiclassical limit. Direct numerical studies of realistic lattice models in one dimension (Bohrdt et al., 2017; Luitz and Bar Lev, 2017; Xu and Swingle, 2020) have revealed a ballistic growth of operators but no indication of a well defined (i.e. position and velocity independent) Lyapunov exponent and a sharp front.

There have also been studies involving random unitary circuits with a finite dimensional local Hilbert space and no semi-classical limit, which observed the behavior of the OTOC that is qualitatively distinct from the above models (von Keyserlingk et al., 2018; Khemani et al., 2018a; Nahum et al., 2018; Xu and Swingle, 2019); importantly the growth is not identified by a well-defined $\lambda_L$ and the ballistic wavefront is not sharp. However, these models do not have a conserved energy and an associated notion of temperature, thereby making a direct comparison to the chaos bound far from being clear. A recent study (Keselman et al., 2021) has demonstrated a way to access a regime of exponential growth of the OTOC even in random unitary circuits by effectively tuning $v_B \gg \lambda_L \times$ (microscopic length scale), thereby presenting evidence that a finite Hilbert space can have an exponential growth of the OTOC.

The relevance of $\lambda_L$ and $v_B$ for measurable trans-
port quantities has been scrutinized in a number of works. Bounds on transport quantities, such as the viscosity \( (Kovtun \textit{et al.}, 2005) \) and charge diffusion coefficient \( (Hartnoll, 2014) \), have been suggested to hold for strongly interacting phases without quasiparticle excitations. Both of these bounds can be interpreted in terms of energy fluctuations to thermal transport. The statement of the bound was sharpened with the bold proposition \( (Blake, 2016) \) that the relevant velocity scale is set by \( v = v_B \). While there are a number of holographic examples where these bounds have been shown to apply and even be saturated \( (Gu \textit{et al.}, 2017b) \), there are explicit counterexamples where the proposed bounds are violated \( (Gu \textit{et al.}, 2017a; Lucas and Steinberg, 2016) \). Stepping away from concrete models, a ‘hydrodynamic’ understanding of some aspects of operator growth and chaos has also been developed in situations where the exponential regime exists \( (Blake \textit{et al.}, 2018) \).

In general, the relation between diffusive spreading of conserved charges and ballistic growth of non-conserved operators is complicated. For a class of generic random unitary circuits with conserved charges, it was shown that a spreading operator consists of a conserved part spreading diffusively, which acts as a source of nonconserved operators and leads to dissipation at a rate set by the local diffusion current \( (Khemani \textit{et al.}, 2018b) \). The nonconserved operators spread ballistically at a butterfly speed, becoming increasingly entangled with a macroscopic number of degrees of freedom in the system, acting as a dissipative ‘bath’. So in this random unitary circuit approach, the diffusion coefficient need not be related to any of the metrics associated with the OTOCs.

However a close relationship has been found between the OTOC \( \lambda_L \) and the \textit{thermal} diffusivity in computations for the critical Fermi surface \( (Patel and Sachdev, 2017) \), and in a wide class of holographic models \( (Blake \textit{et al.}, 2017) \). The relationship between the thermal diffusivity and \( v_B^2/\lambda_L \) has also been analyzed in a family of strongly interacting bosonic variants of the SYK model \( (Tulipman and Berg, 2021) \), which are more closely related to the quantum spherical \( p \)-spin-glass model \( (Cugliandolo \textit{et al.}, 2001) \), inspired by the observation of Planckian diffusivities in a class of complex insulators \( (Mousatov and Hartnoll, 2020; Zhang \textit{et al.}, 2019) \). A simplified interpretation is that both quantum chaos and thermal diffusivity are related to loss of phase coherence. The time derivative of a local phase is the local energy density, and the fluctuation-dissipation theorem relates energy fluctuations to thermal transport.

The exact relation between OTOCs and universal aspects of transport remains unclear. Inspired by the universality of scattering rates across distinct materials displaying non-Fermi liquid properties, it has been conjectured \( (Chowdhury \textit{et al.}, 2018) \) that there is an emergent length scale, \( \ell \gg a \) (= lattice spacing), which is characterized by maximal chaos with a Lyapunov exponent \( \lambda_L = 2\pi T \) at low temperature (i.e. either as \( T \to 0 \), or, \( T > W^* \) but still small compared to microscopic energy scales) and effectively reaches local thermal equilibrium in a time of order \( 1/T \) \( (Sachdev, 1999) \). The universal coarse-grained description for the non-Fermi liquids can then possibly be built by coupling the islands of typical size \( \ell \). This does not imply that the system is necessarily maximally chaotic at the scale of the system size. In constrast, in a system with quasiparticles that does not display any non-Fermi liquid behavior, we expect that \( \lambda_L \ll T \) as \( T \to 0 \).

We end by noting that a different diagnostic of quantum chaos, which measures the correlations between energy levels and diagnoses the spectral ‘rigidity’, is the spectral form factor \( (SFF) \). The SFF has been analyzed in the past in the context of mesoscopic physics and random matrix theory \( (Altshuler and Shklovskii, 1986) \). The celebrated ‘ramp-plateau’ form of the SFF beyond the Thouless time, signifies the onset of chaotic random matrix like behavior and has been analyzed for the SYK model using a variety of different methods \( (Altland and Bagrets, 2018; Altland \textit{et al.}, 2021; Cotler \textit{et al.}, 2017; García-García and Verbaarschot, 2017; Gharibyan \textit{et al.}, 2018; Liao \textit{et al.}, 2020; Saad \textit{et al.}, 2018; Winer \textit{et al.}, 2020) \).

### XIII. OUTLOOK

Finding models of interacting electrons that can be solved reliably in the regime of strong interactions and at finite temperatures, without making uncontrolled approximations, remains a key challenge in quantum many-body physics. The family of models studied in this review offer a remarkably useful starting point for describing compressible metallic phases without any ‘Landau’ quasiparticles at strong interactions. Furthermore, they naturally lead to nFL regimes exhibiting electronic interaction induced \( T \)–linear resistivity and Planckian behavior over a wide range of energy scales and are accompanied by \( (\omega/T) \)–scaling. The theoretical results reviewed here are consistent with much of the universal experimental nFL phenomenology across numerous distinct microscopic materials. Therefore, it is natural to consider the possibility that a large class of strongly interacting microscopic models describing real materials \( \text{flow} \) (in a RG sense) to the different families of models considered in this article, over a significant intermediate energy range. Proving this remains an outstanding challenge.

A notable recent result in the study of non-Fermi liquids is the phase diagram of Fig. 12 \( (Dumitrescu \textit{et al.}, 2021; Shackleton \textit{et al.}, 2021) \). This presents the results of a numerical study of the doped random exchange \( t \)-\( U \)-\( J \) Hubbard model. Many features of the phase di-
agram are reminiscent of the observations in the hole-doped cuprates, as we discussed in Section VII.G. These include a doping induced transition from a disordered Fermi liquid satisfying Luttinger’s theorem for $p > p_c$ to a low temperature metallic spin glass for $p < p_c$. At higher temperatures, the latter has a small carrier density and violates Luttinger’s theorem. The quantum critical metal near $p = p_c$ exhibits a single-particle lifetime that has a Planckian form (see Fig. 13) with an $O(1)$ coefficient; in the low-temperature limit the inferred resistivity is significantly below the MIR value. The quantum critical spin correlations are given by those of the SY spin liquid.

At first sight, this concordance is remarkable and puzzling; the theory relies on a random exchange coupling with zero mean, which is far from the physical situation in the cuprates. We can take the concordance as an indication that AdS$_5$/SYK ‘local’ criticality has a robustness, and can be present in models over a significant intermediate energy range. We note the renormalization group arguments (Patel and Sachdev, 2019) that enhancement of resonant scattering can lead to the emergence of local SYK criticality. We also discussed holographic evidence of such a crossover (Iqbal et al., 2011, 2012; Liu and Sonner, 2020) in disorder-free non-Fermi liquids of Fermi surfaces coupled to gauge fields in Section XII.D. See also other thoughts (Khveshchenko, 2018a) on the emergence of SYK local criticality.

The universality of the models studied is also encoded in their remarkable maximal many-body chaos, as diagnosed using the OTOC. Whether this aspect also indirectly controls the universality of Planckian transport scattering rates across distinct nFL materials is an important and non-trivial theoretical question. A recent work has highlighted some of the fundamental differences between the growth of operators in maximally chaotic vs. non maximally chaotic quantum systems (Blake and Liu, 2021), which could be of some relevance to understanding transport in nFL without quasiparticles.

For the disordered models considered in Section VII, the SY spin liquid behavior (Joshi et al., 2020) cannot extend down to $T = 0$ because of the divergence of the spin glass susceptibility (Georges et al., 2000, 2001) (although this instability is not visible over the accessible temperature range in the Planckian behavior in Fig. 13).

So we expect the eventual appearance of a metallic spin glass or a disordered Fermi liquid in which the zero temperature entropy is quenched, with the SY spin liquid surviving at $T = 0$ only at the ‘spindal’ critical point where the Fermi liquid solution disappears. In more realistic models with weak disorder, we can expect the pseudogap to acquire the topological order of a fractionalized Fermi liquid, or have spin or charge density wave order. The critical theory asymptotically close to the pseudogap critical point will also be different: for the models of Section VII, we can expect a transition from a disordered Fermi liquid to a metallic spin glass, as described in theories without fractionalization (Sachdev et al., 1995; Sengupta and Georges, 1995). The connections between the transition outlined above and ‘deconfined’ metallic criticality (Zhang and Sachdev, 2020; Zou and Chowdhury, 2020) associated with abrupt Fermi surface changing transitions in clean systems, and in the absence of fractionalization in the adjacent phase, remains an interesting open problem.

Another consequence of models with $J_{ij}$ having zero mean is that there is no superconductivity. Adding a non-zero mean $J_{ij}$, or other attractive interaction should lead to superconductivity (Chowdhury and Berg, 2020; Esterlis and Schmalian, 2019; Hauck et al., 2020; Patel et al., 2018a; Wang et al., 2020; Wang, 2020), and a theory is needed for the onset of superconductivity from the Planckian metal phase of Figs. 12 and 13.

For models without disorder, we discussed theories of non-Fermi liquids with critical Fermi surfaces in Section XI. Such theories have zero resistivity in the absence of exponentially weak umklapp scattering, and so cannot produce linear-in-$T$ resistivity at low $T$. It would be useful to have a theory which interpolates from this ultra-clean limit to the strong but self-averaging disorder in the theories of Sections VII and VIII. Recent progress along this direction was noted in Section XI.B.

An emerging application of the SYK model is to mesoscopic systems, and this has not been covered in our review. In this context, the behavior of the SYK model at finite $N$ is important, and we have to reverse the orders of limit of $N \to \infty$ (which we generally have taken first) and long time $t \to \infty$. The SYK model has a new emergent criticality for $t > N/U$, some aspects of which were covered in Section V.F. Note that even for finite but large $N$, we do not immediately have a crossover to a regime where the discreteness of the energy spectrum is important; in a many-body system, the energy level spacing $\sim \exp(-\alpha N)$, and so even for $t > N/U$ we deal with an effectively continuous spectrum. We refer the reader to the literature for studies of applications to quantum dots (Altland et al., 2019a,b; Gnezdilov et al., 2018; Khveshchenko, 2019; Kobrin et al., 2021; Kruchkov et al., 2020; Micklitz et al., 2019; Pavlov and Kiselev, 2021; Pikulin and Franz, 2017), and to lattices of quantum dots (Altland et al., 2019a; Khveshchenko, 2020). The latter keep $N$ finite, and so differ from the models in Section X, which take the $N \to \infty$ first. In Sections VI, VII, and VIII, our interest was in dynamical mean field theories of lattice systems in the thermodynamic limit, and so it was appropriate to the $N \to \infty$ limit first.
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Appendix A: Time reparametrization and gauge symmetries of the SYK model

In this appendix, we will elaborate on the origin of Eq. (5.22) from a more fundamental basis, and generalize it to the particle-hole asymmetric case. We return to the original equations Eq. (5.2a) and Eq. (5.2b), and simplify them in the low energy limit. As we saw in Eq. (5.13), at frequencies \( \omega \ll U \), the \( \omega + \mu \) can be dropped, because \( \mu - \Sigma(0) = 0 \) and the \( \omega_n \) term is smaller than the singular frequency dependence in \( \Sigma(\omega_n) \). After Fourier transforming to the time domain, we can rewrite the original saddle-point equations as

\[
\int_0^\beta d\tau_2 \Sigma_{\text{sing}}(\tau_1, \tau_2) G(\tau_2, \tau_3) = -\delta(\tau_1 - \tau_3) \tag{A1a}
\]

\[
\Sigma_{\text{sing}}(\tau_1, \tau_2) = -U^2 G^2(\tau_1, \tau_2) G(\tau_2, \tau_1), \tag{A1b}
\]

where \( \Sigma_{\text{sing}} \) is the singular part of \( \Sigma \). Also the saddle point Green’s functions and self energies are functions only of time differences, like \( \tau_1 - \tau_2 \). Nevertheless, we have written them as a function of two independent times, because the fluctuations about the saddle point will involve the bilocal fields, as we will see. Moreover, the symmetries are more transparent in the bilocal formulation.

It is now not difficult to verify that Eq. (A1a) and Eq. (A1b) are invariant under the following transformation

\[
\tau = f(\sigma) \tag{A2a}
\]

\[
G(\tau_1, \tau_2) = [f'(\sigma_1)f'(\sigma_2)]^{-1/4} \frac{g(\sigma_1)}{g(\sigma_2)} \tilde{G}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \tag{A2b}
\]

\[
\Sigma(\tau_1, \tau_2) = [f'(\sigma_1)f'(\sigma_2)]^{-3/4} \frac{\delta(\sigma_1)}{\delta(\sigma_2)} \tilde{\Sigma}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \tag{A2c}
\]

where \( f(\sigma) \) and \( g(\sigma) \) are arbitrary functions. Here \( f(\sigma) \) is a time reparametrization, and \( g(\sigma) \) is a U(1) gauge transformation in imaginary time. These are emergent symmetries because the form of the equations obeyed by \( \tilde{G}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \) and \( \tilde{\Sigma}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \) is the same as Eq. (A1a) and Eq. (A1b) obeyed by \( G(\tau_1, \tau_2) \) and \( \Sigma(\tau_1, \tau_2) \).

We obtain the non-zero temperature solution by choosing the time reparametrization in Eq. (A2a) as the con-

formal map

\[
\tau = \frac{1}{\pi T} \tan(\pi T \sigma) \tag{A3}
\]

where \( \sigma \) is the periodic imaginary time co-ordinate with period \( 1/T \). Applying this map to Eq. (5.7) we obtain

\[
G(\pm \sigma) = \mp C g(\pm \sigma) \sin(\pi/4 + \theta) \left( \frac{T}{\sin(\pi T \sigma)} \right)^{1/2}, \tag{A4}
\]

for \( 0 < \pm \sigma < 1/T \). The function \( g(\sigma) \) is so far undetermined apart from a normalization choice \( g(0) = 1 \). We can now determine \( g(\sigma) \) by imposing the KMS condition

\[
G(\sigma + 1/T) = -G(\sigma) \tag{A5}
\]

which implies

\[
g(\sigma) = \tan(\pi/4 + \theta) g(\sigma + 1/T). \tag{A6}
\]

The solution is clearly

\[
g(\sigma) = e^{-2\pi E T \sigma} \tag{A7}
\]

where the new parameter \( E \) and the angle \( \theta \) are related as in Eq. (5.10). This yields the final expression for \( G(\sigma) \) in (5.25).

Appendix B: Symmetries of the SYK saddle point

We showed in Appendix A that the low energy limit of the saddle point equations in Eq. (A1a) and Eq. (A1b) have a very large set of symmetries, when expressed in terms of bilocal correlators of \( 2 \) times. However, the actual solution of the saddle point equations in Eq. (5.25) is a function only of time differences. Here we ask a somewhat different question: what subgroup of the symmetries in Appendix A apply to the thermal solution in Eq. (5.25). In other words, how are the emergent low energy time reparametrization and gauge symmetries broken by the low \( T \) thermal state?

First, let us consider the simplest case with particle-hole symmetry at \( T = 0 \), when we can schematically represent the large \( N \) solutions in Section V.A as

\[
G_c(\tau_1 - \tau_2) \sim (\tau_1 - \tau_2)^{-1/2},
\]

\[
\Sigma_s(\tau_1 - \tau_2) \sim (\tau_1 - \tau_2)^{-3/2}.
\]

The saddle point will be invariant under a reparameterization \( f(\tau) \) when choosing \( G(\tau_1, \tau_2) = G_c(\tau_1 - \tau_2) \) leads to a transformed \( \tilde{G}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) = G_c(\sigma_1 - \sigma_2) \) (and similarly for \( \Sigma \)). It turns out this is true only for the SL(2, R) transformations under which

\[
f(\tau) = \frac{a \tau + b}{c \tau + d}, \quad ad - bc = 1. \tag{B1}
\]
So the (approximate) reparameterization symmetry is spontaneously broken down to SL(2, R) by the saddle point.

Now let us consider the most general case with $T > 0$ and no particle-hole symmetry. We write Eq. (A2c) as

$$G(\tau_1, \tau_2) = [f'(\tau_1)f'(\tau_2)]^{1/4} \times G_c(f(\tau_1) - f(\tau_2))e^{i\phi(\tau_1) - i\phi(\tau_2)}, \quad (B2)$$

where $G_c(\tau)$ is the conformal saddle point solution given in Eq. (5.25). Here, we have parameterized $g(\tau) = e^{-i\phi(\tau)}$ in terms of a phase field $\phi$; we will soon see that the derivative of $\phi$ is conjugate to density fluctuations.

It can now be checked that the $G(\tau_1, \tau_2)$ obtained from Eq. (B2) equals $G_c(\tau_1 - \tau_2)$ only if the transformations $f(\tau)$ and $\phi(\tau)$ satisfy

$$\tan(\pi T f(\tau)) = \frac{a\tan(\pi T \tau) + b}{c\tan(\pi T \tau) + d}, \quad ad - bc = 1,$$

$$-i\phi(\tau) = -i\phi_0 + 2\pi \mathcal{E}T(\tau - f(\tau)) \quad (B3)$$

The transformation of $f(\tau)$ looks rather mysterious, but we can simplify it as follows: we define

$$z = e^{2\pi T \tau} \quad , \quad z_f = e^{2\pi T f(\tau)} \quad (B4)$$

and then the transformation in Eq. (B3) is between unimodular complex numbers representing the thermal circle

$$z_f = \frac{w_1z + w_2}{w_2^* z + w_1^*}, \quad |w_1|^2 - |w_2|^2 = 1, \quad (B5)$$

where $w_{1,2}$ are complex numbers. In this form, we have a SU(1,1) transformation, a group which is isomorphic to SL(2,R).

The symmetries in Eq. (B3) and (B5) are crucial in determining the structure of the low energy action for fluctuations.

**Appendix C: Symmetries of AdS$_2$**

This Appendix notes that the AdS$_2$ metric

$$ds^2 = \frac{dr^2 + d\xi^2}{\xi^2} \quad (C1)$$

is invariant under isometries which are SL(2,R) transformations, as in Eq. (B1). It is easy to verify that the co-ordinate change

$$\tau' + i\xi' = \frac{a(\tau + i\xi) + b}{c(\tau + i\xi) + d}, \quad ad - bc = 1, \quad (C2)$$

with $a,b,c,d$ real, leaves the metric (C1) in variant.

**Appendix D: Schwarzian determinant**

This appendix will evaluate quadratic fluctuation correction to the free energy of the SYK model in Eq. (5.76) arising from the time reparameterization mode in Eq. (5.74). The formal expression for this correction is

$$I = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n \neq 0, \pm 1} \ln [2\pi^2 N \gamma T n^2 (n^2 - 1)] \quad . \quad (D1)$$

This expression is clearly divergent, and we have to regulate it by finding the proper measure over the path integral of the $\epsilon_n$ in Eq. (5.74) (Maldacena et al., 2016b; Stanford and Witten, 2017). For simplicity, we will only consider the particle-hole symmetric case $\mu = 0$ in our discussion below, but the final result is more general.

We will regulate the divergence in Eq. (D1) by returning to the original $G$-$\Sigma$ path integral in Eq. (5.56) to which the Schwarzian path integral in Eq. (5.73) is a low energy approximation. The saddle-point equations of Eq. (5.56) are simply the original SYK equations Eqs. (5.2a,5.2b). Denoting the exact saddle point solution of the latter as $\tilde{G}$ and $\tilde{\Sigma}$, we can write the fluctuations as

$$G = \tilde{G} + \delta G, \quad \Sigma = \tilde{\Sigma} + \delta \Sigma. \quad (D2)$$

Then we expand the action in Eq. (5.56) to quadratic order, and find that the needed eigenmodes of the quadratic fluctuations are eigenmodes of the kernels (Gu et al., 2020; Tikhanovskaya et al., 2021a) which generalize that in Eq. (5.48)

$$K_{A/S}(\tau_1, \tau_2; \tau_3, \tau_4) = \int \mathcal{D}\tau_1 \mathcal{D}\tau_2 \mathcal{D}\tau_3 \mathcal{D}\tau_4 \mathcal{S}_{A/S}(\tau_1, \tau_2; \tau_3, \tau_4)$$

We are considering the general case of SYK model with $q$ fermion terms, and $\tau_{ij} \equiv \tau_i - \tau_j$. The eigenmodes are defined by the equations (which generalize Eq. (5.47))

$$k_{A/S}(h)\psi^{A/S}_{hl}(\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_0) = \int d\tau_3 d\tau_4 K_{A/S}(\tau_1, \tau_2; \tau_3, \tau_4)\psi^{A/S}_{hl}(\tau_3, \tau_4, \tau_0), \quad (D4)$$

with dimensionless eigenvalue $k_{A/S}(h)$. For $k_{A/S}(h) = 1$ we obtain the scaling dimension $h$ of composite operators associated with the fermion bilinears in the conformal limit theory. Our overall task is to expand $\delta G$ and $\delta \Sigma$ in terms of the eigenmodes of $K_{A/S}$, each of which will also be eigenmodes of the quadratic fluctuation of the action in Eq. (5.56).

The Schwarzian fluctuation focuses on a specific eigenmode, $\psi_{hl}^A$, which is associated with time reparameterization symmetry. The infinitesimal version of the time reparameterization in Eq. (B2), using Eq. (5.68), is

$$\delta G(\tau_1, \tau_2) = [\Delta e'(\tau_1) + \Delta e'(\tau_2)]$$

$$+ \epsilon(\tau_1)\partial_{\tau_1} + \epsilon(\tau_2)\partial_{\tau_2}] G(\tau_1 - \tau_2). \quad (D5)$$
For the conformal limit result, \( \overline{G} = G_c \) in Eq. (5.25), and also for conformal Green’s functions in Eq. (D3), \( \delta G \) in Eq. (D5) is indeed an eigenmode \( \psi_{\Omega} \) of Eq. (D4) with \( k_A(2) = 1 \), as can be verified by explicit evaluation.

We now have all the ingredients necessary to expand the time reparameterization eigenmode of \( K_A \) in terms of the eigenmodes \( \epsilon_n \) in Eq. (5.74). One needed technical step is that we multiply the \( K_A \) eigenmode by \( G_\Omega^{q-2}/2 \) to make the kernel in Eq. (D3) a Hermitian operator. Then we write

\[
\begin{align*}
\left[G_c(\tau_1, \tau_2)\right]_{(q-2)/2} \delta G(\tau_1, \tau_2) &= \\
\sum_n \epsilon_n f_n \left(2\pi T[\tau_1 - \tau_2]\right) e^{-i\pi T(\tau_1 + \tau_2)} .
\end{align*}
\] (D6)

We can easily obtain the explicit form of the co-efficients \( f_n(\theta) \) in this expansion by using Eqs. (5.25), (5.74) and (D5):

\[
f_n(\theta) = \frac{\sin(n\theta/2) \cos(\theta/2)}{\sin^2(\theta/2)} - n \frac{\cos(n\theta/2)}{\sin(\theta/2)} .
\] (D7)

Recall we are working at \( \mu = \mathcal{E} = 0 \), and we have dropped an unimportant \( n \)-independent prefactor in Eq. (D7). The functions \( f_n(\theta) \) are analogs for SL(2,R) of the Legendre polynomials for SO(3). As expected, they vanish identically for \( n = 0, \pm 1 \) because \( G_c \) is invariant under SL(2,R) transformations. The property we need here is the \( n \)-dependence of their normalization

\[
\int_0^{2\pi} d\theta/2 \left| f_n(\theta) \right|^2 = \frac{|n|(n^2 - 1)}{3} .
\] (D8)

Using the eigenmodes of Eq. (D3), the Gaussian fluctuation contribution to the free energy from the \( G-\Sigma \) path integral in Eq. (5.56) can be written schematically as (Maldacena et al., 2016b)

\[
\mathcal{I}_{G-\Sigma} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_n \ln \left( \frac{1}{k_A/S(h)} - 1 \right) .
\] (D9)

We now compare this \( G-\Sigma \) form of the fluctuation contribution, with the \( \epsilon_n \) fluctuation contribution in Eq. (D1). Given the transformation between the eigenmodes in Eq. (D6), and the normalization in Eq. (D8), we conclude that the \( n^2(n^2 - 1) \) factor in Eq. (D1) should be identified with the product of a \( |n|(n^2 - 1) \) factor from Eq. (D8), and a \( (1 - k_A(2))/T |n|/U \) factor. The deviation of \( k_A(2) \) from unity arises from conformal corrections to the saddle point \( \overline{G} \rightarrow G_c \), and arguments have been given (Maldacena et al., 2016b) for their \( |n| \) dependence.

With this corrected measure for \( \epsilon_n \) fluctuations, we conclude that the properly regulated form of Eq. (D1) is that deduced from Eq. (D9) (Maldacena et al., 2016b)

\[
\tilde{I} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{|n| \neq 0, \pm 1} \ln \left( \frac{T|n|}{U} \right) ,
\] (D10)

where we have dropped \( T \)-independent constants, and \( c_1 \) is a non-universal number determining the high energy cutoff. We can now apply the \( \zeta \) function theory result

\[
\sum_{n=1}^{m} \ln(na) = m \ln(am) - m + \ln(2\pi m) - \frac{3}{2} + O \left( \frac{1}{m} \right) \] (D11)

to Eq. (D10), and obtain Eq. (5.77). Note the \( 3/2 \) co-efficient of the logarithm in Eq. (5.77) is independent of \( c_1 \); it is the sum of the \( 1/2 \) co-efficient in Eq. (D11), and the omitted \( n = \pm 1 \) contributions in Eq. (D10).

**Appendix E: Patch theory of a Fermi liquid**

In this appendix, we review some basic results of the effective field theory for interacting fermions in \( d \)-dimensions. We consider fermions \( \epsilon_{k\alpha} \) with momentum \( k \), spin \( a = \uparrow, \downarrow \) and dispersion \( \epsilon_k \). We will consider a more general theory where the index takes values \( a = 1 \ldots N \). Thus the non-interacting fermions are described by the imaginary-time action

\[
S_c = \int d\tau \int d^d k/ (2\pi)^d \epsilon_{ka} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} + \epsilon_k \right) c_{ka} .
\] (E1)

The fermion Green’s function under the free fermion action \( S_c \) has the simple form

\[
G_0(k, i\omega_n) = \frac{1}{i\omega_n - \epsilon_k} .
\] (E2)

After analytically continuing to real frequencies, we observe that this Green’s function has a pole at energy \( \epsilon_k \) with a quasiparticle residue \( Z = 1 \).

We now wish to examine the stability of excitations near the Fermi surface by writing down an effective action for the low energy quasiparticles using a gradient expansion, leading to an effective field theory. However, the unique difficulty when dealing with a finite density of electrons is that there are zero energy quasiparticles along a \( (d - 1) \)-dimensional Fermi surface identified by \( \epsilon_k = 0 \). It would therefore seem that we should expand about all points on the Fermi surface, which is the strategy followed in textbook treatments of Fermi liquid theory. We measure momenta, \( k_\perp \), from the Fermi surface, choose a cutoff so that \( |k_\perp| < \Lambda \), and then perform a renormalization group analysis which reduces the value of \( \Lambda \) (Shankar, 1994). This procedure is illustrated in Fig. 23. Formally, for each direction \( \hat{n} \), we define the position of the Fermi surface by the wavevector \( k_F(\hat{n}) \), so that \( \hat{n} = k_F(\hat{n})/|k_F(\hat{n})| \). Then we identify wavevectors near the Fermi surface by

\[
k = k_F(\hat{n}) + k_\perp \hat{n} .
\] (E3)

Now we should expand in small momenta \( k_\perp \). For this, we define an infinite set of fields \( \psi_{\alpha a}(k_\perp) \), which are labeled by the spin \( a \) and the direction \( \hat{n} \), related to the
fermions \( c \) by
\[
c_{ka} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{S_F}} \psi_{\hat{n}a}(k_\perp), \tag{E4}
\]
where \( k \) and \( k_\perp \) are related by Eq. (E3), and \( S_F \) is the area of the Fermi surface. Inserting Eq. (E4) into Eq. (E1), expanding in \( k_\perp \), and Fourier transforming to real space \( x_\perp \), we obtain the low energy theory
\[
S_{FL} = \int d\Omega \int d\xi \int dx_\perp \psi_{\hat{n}a}^\dagger(x_\perp) \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x_\perp} - iv_F(\hat{n}) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_\perp} \right) \psi_{\hat{n}a}(x_\perp), \tag{E5}
\]
where the Fermi velocity is energy gradient on the Fermi surface \( v_F(\hat{n}) = |\nabla k_\perp| \). For each \( \hat{n} \), Eq. (E5) describes the action for a one-dimensional ‘chiral’ fermion moving along the single dimension \( x_\perp \) with the Fermi velocity; the chiral refers to the fact that the fermion only moves in the positive \( x_\perp \) direction, and not the negative \( x_\perp \) direction. In other words, the low energy theory of the Fermi liquid is an infinite set of one-dimensional chiral fermions, defined at each point on the Fermi surface.

A shortcoming of the effective action in Eq. (E5) is that it only includes the dispersion of the fermions transverse to the Fermi surface. Thus, if we discretize the directions \( \hat{n} \), and pick a given point on the Fermi surface, the Fermi surface is effectively flat at that point. We will shortly see that the curvature of the Fermi surface is important in understanding the decay and lifetime of quasiparticles. Thus we have to take the continuum scaling limit in a manner which keeps the curvature of the Fermi surface fixed, and does not scale it to zero. For this, as shown in Fig. 24, we focus attention on a single segment of the Fermi surface in the vicinity of any chosen point, \( k_0 \). Let us now redefine our low energy theory (Metlitski and Sachdev, 2010), going beyond the expansion in terms of the one-dimensional chiral fermions which appeared in Eq. (E5). We will now use a \( d \) dimensional fermion, \( \psi_a(x,y) \), where \( x \) is the one dimensional co-ordinate orthogonal to the Fermi surface, and \( y \) represents the \((d-1)\)-dimensional transverse co-ordinates. This fermion is related to the underlying fermions \( c_{ka} \) simply by
\[
\psi_a(k) = c_{k_0 + k,a}. \tag{E6}
\]
In other words, we only shift the origin of momentum space from \( k = 0 \) to \( k = k_0 \). Inserting Eq. (E6) in Eq. (E1), and expanding the dispersion in the vicinity of \( k_0 \) (contrast to the expansion away from all points on the Fermi surface in Eq. (E5)), we obtain the low energy theory
\[
S_0 = \int d\tau \int dx \int d^{d-1}y \; \psi_a^\dagger \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} - iv_F \frac{\partial}{\partial x} - \frac{\kappa}{2} \nabla_y^2 \right) \psi_a. \tag{E7}
\]
Notice the additional second-order gradients in \( y \) which were missing from Eq. (E5); the co-efficient, \( \kappa \), is proportional to the curvature of the Fermi surface at \( k_0 \). There are zero energy fermionic excitations when
\[
v_F k_x + \frac{k_y^2}{2} = 0, \tag{E8}
\]
and so Eq. (E8) defines the position of the Fermi surface, which is then part of the low energy theory including its curvature. Note that unlike Eq. (E5), where the one-dimensional chiral fermion theory for each \( \hat{n} \) describes only a single point on the Fermi surface, Eq. (E7) now includes an extended portion of the Fermi surface.

Let us now examine the consequences of a short-ranged (contact) interaction described by the action,
\[
S_1 = \frac{u_0}{2} \int d\tau \int dx \int d^{d-1}y \; \Psi_a^\dagger \Psi_b^\dagger \Psi_b \Psi_a, \tag{E9}
\]
perturbatively in the interaction strength, $u_0$, in the patch theory introduced above. Note the dependence of the interaction on the spin labels, $a, b$. We write the interaction corrected Green’s function as

$$G(k, i\omega_n) = \frac{1}{i\omega_n - \varepsilon_k - \Sigma(k, i\omega_n)},$$

(E10)

where

$$\varepsilon_k = v_F k_x + \frac{k_y^2}{2}.$$  

(E11)

To first order in $u_0$, the fermion self energy is real and only modifies the quasiparticle dispersion. At order $u_0^2$, we will only evaluate the diagram in Fig. 25. We evaluate it in two stages. First we evaluate the fermion loop of the fermions with spin label $b$; this gives us the fermion polarizability

$$\Pi(q, i\omega_n) = -\int \frac{d^dk}{(2\pi)^d} T \sum_{\epsilon_n} G_0(k+q, i\epsilon_n + i\omega_n) G_0(k, i\epsilon_n).$$

(E12)

This enters the self-energy by

$$\Sigma(k, i\omega_n) = u_0^2 \int \frac{d^dq}{(2\pi)^d} T \sum_{\epsilon_n} \Pi(q, i\epsilon_n) G_0(k+q, i\epsilon_n + i\omega_n).$$

(E13)

Rather than directly evaluating Eq. (E12) and Eq. (E13) for our subsequent discussion, it turns out to be useful to evaluate a more self-consistent term in which the fermion Green’s functions are replaced by the full Green’s function in Eq. (E10) but with the self energy assumed to be momentum independent:

$$\Sigma(k, i\omega_n) \Rightarrow \Sigma(i\omega_n).$$

(E14)

This assumption will later shown to be self-consistent for the long-wavelength contributions we are interested in. Moreover, in standard evaluations of expressions like Eq. (E12) the frequency summations are performed before the momentum integrations, to yield the Lindhard function. With an unknown self-energy in the Green’s function, it turns out to be better to perform the momentum integrations first, even though this leads to formally divergent expressions. As long as we are interested in singular low energy contributions near the Fermi surface, and not regular contributions from regions far from the Fermi surface, the order of summation and integration should make no difference. Remarkably, this procedure leads to results that are independent of the self-energy in the fermion Green’s function, as we now show.

We first explicitly evaluate $\Pi(q, i\omega_n)$ in Eq. (E12). Noting that $\text{sgn}(\omega_n - \text{Im}[\Sigma(i\omega_n)]) = \text{sgn}(\omega_n)$, we can perform the integration over $k_x$, and then the integral over the component of $k_y$ parallel to $q_y$ using the method of residues to yield

$$\Pi(q, i\omega_n) = -\frac{i}{2v_F} \sum_{\epsilon_n} \int \frac{d^{d-1}k_y}{(2\pi)^{d-1}} \left[ \frac{1}{\text{sgn}(\epsilon_n + \omega_n) - \text{sgn}(\epsilon_n)} \right]$$

$$\times \frac{1}{i\omega_n - v_F q_x - \kappa q_y^2/2 - \kappa q_y \cdot k_y + \Sigma(i\epsilon_n) - \Sigma(i\epsilon_n + i\omega_n)}$$

$$= \frac{T}{4\pi v_F |q_y|} \sum_{\epsilon_n} \int \frac{d^{d-2}k_y}{(2\pi)^{d-2}} \text{sgn}(\epsilon_n) \left[ \frac{1}{\text{sgn}(\epsilon_n + \omega_n) - \text{sgn}(\epsilon_n)} \right].$$

Finally, we perform the summation over $\epsilon_n$ to obtain

$$\Pi(q, i\omega_n) = \frac{-|\omega_n|}{4\pi v_F |q_y|} \int \frac{d^{d-2}k_y}{(2\pi)^{d-2}}$$

$$= \frac{-|\omega_n|}{4\pi v_F |q_y|} \Lambda^{d-2},$$

(E15)

where we have replaced the integral over the remaining $(d-2)$ dimensions by a cutoff $\Lambda$ of order the Fermi wavevector. Note that in $d = 2$ the last non-universal factor is not present, and the result for $\Pi$ is universal with $\Lambda^{d-2} = 1$.

Next we insert Eq. (E15) into Eq. (E13), while including the self energy Eq. (E14) in the fermion Green’s function. We can perform the integral over $q_x$ as above, and the result is independent of this self energy

$$\Sigma(k, i\omega_n) = -i \frac{N u_0^2}{8\pi v_F} \left\{ \int \frac{d^{d-1}q_y}{(2\pi)^{d-1}} \frac{1}{|q_y|} \right\}$$

$$\times \left[ T \sum_{\epsilon_n} \text{sgn}(\epsilon_n + \omega_n) |\epsilon_n| \right]$$

$$= -i \frac{N u_0^2}{8\pi v_F} \left\{ \int \frac{d^{d-1}q_y}{(2\pi)^{d-1}} \frac{1}{|q_y|} \right\} \frac{\omega_n^2 - \pi^2 T^2}{2\pi}.$$  

(E16)

We comment on several notable features of Eq. (E16):

- Both Eq. (E15) and Eq. (E16) are fully self consistent, and are not modified by including $\Sigma(i\omega_n)$ in the fermion Green’s function.
- This contribution to the self energy is independent of $k$, so the assumption in Eq. (E14) is indeed self-consistent.
- The integral over $q_y$ is cutoff-dependent and so yields a non-universal prefactor. A more complete evaluation using the fermion dispersion across the full Fermi surface is needed to obtain the correct prefactor.
The integral over $q_y$ has a logarithmic infrared divergence in $d = 2$. We expect that this divergence will be cut off by the external frequency, and so yield a $\ln(\omega_n, T)$ factor. The co-efficient of the logarithmically divergent term in $d = 2$ is universal, and so is accurately evaluated by the present long wavelength theory.

The final result confirms our expectations from Fermi liquid theory: the imaginary part of the fermion self energy $\sim \omega^2, T^2$ close to the Fermi surface. A somewhat unexpected feature is that these terms have a logarithmic correction in $d = 2$, but that is not sufficient to destroy the presence of sharp quasiparticles.

Appendix F: Generalization to SYK$_q$ model

Much of our discussion of the SYK model has focused on the physically motivated problem with four-fermion interactions. However, the model can be readily generalized to $q \geq 4$ fermion interactions (Gross and Rosenhaus, 2017), otherwise referred to as the SYK$_q$ model. We review here the low-energy properties of a local SYK$_q$ model and the effect of perturbing it by a quadratic (hopping) term. The interaction Hamiltonian for electrons occupying orbitals labeled $i = 1, ..., N$ is given by,

$$H_q = \frac{q/2}{N} \sum_{\{i\}} U_{i_1 i_2 ... i_q} \left( c_{i_1}^\dagger c_{i_2}^\dagger ... c_{i_{q/2}}^\dagger c_{i_{q/2+1}} ... c_{i_q} \right) - \mu \sum_{i} c_i^\dagger c_i,$$

where as before we choose the couplings $U_{i_1 i_2 ... i_q}$ to be independent random variables with $U_{i_1 i_2 ... i_q} = 0$, and $\langle U_{i_1 i_2 ... i_q}^2 \rangle = U^2$. The density, $\rho$, can be tuned by an external chemical potential, $\mu$.

In the large $N$ limit, once again only the melon graphs survive, but the number of internal legs is now $(q-1)$. The on-site Green’s function reduces to the solution of the equations

$$G(i\omega_n) = \frac{1}{i\omega_n + \mu - \Sigma(i\omega_n)}$$

$$\Sigma(\tau) = -U^2[G(\tau)]^{q/2}[G(-\tau)]^{q/2-1}$$

$$G(\tau = 0^-) = \mathcal{Q}.$$  

Following the analysis in Sec. V.A, we can obtain the low energy solution at $T = 0$ for the electron Green’s function. Importantly, the power-law singularity at low frequencies is now determined by the dimension, $\Delta = 1/q$, such that the Green’s function has the form,

$$G(\tau) \sim \frac{\text{sgn}(\tau)}{(U|\tau|)^{2/q}}, \quad |\tau| \gg 1/U \quad (F3a)$$

$$G(i\omega) \sim \frac{\text{sgn}(\omega)}{U^{2/q} |\omega|^1 - 2/q}, \quad |\omega| \ll U. \quad (F3b)$$

For the sake of simplicity, we chose the density to be at half-filling where the spectral asymmetry vanishes. In spite of the different scaling dimension, the finite compressibility and residual entropy (including the $T-$linear correction) have the same qualitative behavior as the model with $q = 4$.

Let us now consider a lattice generalization of the model as in Sec. X, where the local interaction at every site is given by $H_q$, and the sites are coupled together via uniform translationally invariant hopping terms, $H_{\text{kin}}$ (see Eq. 10.1a). The hopping term is a relevant perturbation and the gapless scale invariant solutions cannot survive down to the lowest energies. Starting from the decoupled limit, one finds that the coherence scale is given by

$$W_q^* \sim t \left( \frac{t}{U} \right)^{(q-2)/q}, \quad (F4)$$

below which the hopping terms can no longer be treated perturbatively and the ground state is a Fermi liquid. In spite of the similarities in the thermodynamic properties with the $q = 4$ model, charge transport is dramatically different for $T > W_q^*$. The electrical resistivity in the incoherent regime is now given by,

$$\rho_{\text{dc}} \sim \frac{h}{Ne^2} \left( \frac{T}{W_q^*} \right)^{2-4/q}. \quad (F5)$$

Interestingly, for $q \neq 4$ the resistivity scales faster than $T$ (but slower than $T^2$) with increasing temperature. Importantly, the $T-$linearity of the resistivity is tied to the electron scaling dimension of $\Delta = 1/4$ for $q = 4$.
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