

Effect of spin on electron motion in a random magnetic field

K. Takahashi¹ and K. B. Efetov^{1;2}

¹ Theoretische Physik III, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, D-44780 Bochum, Germany

² L.D. Landau Institute for Theoretical Physics, 117940 Moscow, Russia

(January 10, 2022)

We consider properties of a two-dimensional electron system in a random magnetic field. It is assumed that the magnetic field not only influences orbital electron motion but also acts on the electron spin. For calculations, we suggest the trick of replacing the initial Hamiltonian by a Dirac Hamiltonian. This allows us to do easily a perturbation theory and derive a supermatrix model, which takes a form of the conventional model with the unitary symmetry. Using this model we calculate several correlation functions including a spin-spin correlation function. As compared to the model without spin, we get different expressions for the single-particle lifetime and the transport time. The diffusion constant turns out to be 2 times smaller than the one for spinless particles.

I. INTRODUCTION

The problem of electron motion in a random magnetic field (RMF) has attracted considerable interest in recent years. One of the main questions is how the localization scenario is modified in comparison with the usual disorder problem. It is also thought to be relevant for the behavior of composite fermions near half-filling in the fractional quantum Hall effect.¹ In a recent experiment for a RMF system a magnetoresistance similar to that of the quantum Hall system was observed.²

Analytically, this problem has been discussed using both the diagrammatic³ and the supersymmetry method.^{3;4;5} It turns out that the system belongs to the usual unitary class, which leads to localization in two dimensions (2D) unless the random magnetic fields correlate over a very long distance ($1=q^2$ dependence for the $\hbar q B_{\perp} q$ correlation). As concerns a short range correlations of the RMF, one can derive a conventional nonlinear model using a standard procedure (see, e.g., Ref. 6). With long range correlations one can derive first a ballistic model.⁷ Integrating out nonzero harmonics one comes again to the diffusive model.^{3;4;5} Only if the correlation of the magnetic fields obeys the $1=q^2$ dependence, one may get something different (antilocalization) because, in this case, a new term in the model appears.⁵

A standard Hamiltonian used for the RMF problem has the form

$$H_0 = \frac{1}{2m} \hat{p}^2 - \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}) \cdot \hat{\mathbf{p}}; \quad (1)$$

where e and m are the electron charge and mass, and the vector potential $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r})$ corresponding to the magnetic field $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{r})$ should be averaged with some weight.

Eq.(1) describes electron motion in a magnetic field neglecting interaction of the magnetic field with the electron spin. This is a good approximation for GaAs heterostructures where the Zeeman splitting is very small. In models of composite fermions spin is absent at all

and therefore the Hamiltonian H_0 , Eq.(1), is sufficient for proper description.

Nevertheless, the question about the character of electron motion in a RMF acting also on the electron spin may be interesting on its own. Generally, the interaction of the magnetic field with spin is not smaller than interaction with the orbital motion. Moreover, in a homogeneous magnetic field the Zeeman splitting for free electrons is equal to the distance between Landau levels (see, e.g., Ref. 8) and one may ask if this degeneracy may show up in the inhomogeneous field. To the best of our knowledge the problem of electron motion in a random magnetic field with both orbital and spin interaction with the magnetic field has not been addressed yet.

In this paper we address this problem starting with the Hamiltonian

$$H = H_0 + \frac{g}{2} \mu_B \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{r}) \cdot \hat{\mathbf{S}}; \quad (2)$$

for $g = 2$. Here, $\mu_B = e\hbar/2mc$ is the Bohr magneton, $\hat{\mathbf{S}}$ stands for the components of Pauli matrices and $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{r}) = \nabla \times \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r})$. It is clear that one may not consider the orbital and spin interactions separately. This is in contrast to models describing electron motion in a magnetic field in the presence of magnetic impurities. The effect of the Zeeman term has been examined in Refs. 9, 10 for the case of a scalar random potential and a small constant magnetic field and corrections to the conductivity have been calculated.

One should notice also that, while the interaction with the orbital motion is described by the vector potential $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r})$, the interaction with the spin is determined by the magnetic field $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{r})$ itself. Therefore, averaging over the magnetic field cannot be a trivial procedure and developing a proper calculational scheme may be interesting from the technical point of view.

We suggest a scheme that has not been used in the context of disordered metals. Our idea to discuss the RMF problem for the Hamiltonian with the Zeeman term is to consider a more general Dirac Hamiltonian as a starting

point of the analysis. There are two advantages to use the Dirac Hamiltonian. First, the square of the Dirac Hamiltonian gives Eq.(2). Thus, we can naturally take spin effect into consideration for the analysis. Second, the Dirac Hamiltonian contains only the vector potential $A(r)$ but not the magnetic field $B(r)$. The dependence on the gauge field $A(r)$ is linear, which simplifies the averaging procedure.

The Dirac Hamiltonian has been used for the problem of random Dirac fermions. This problem may be relevant for degenerate semiconductors,¹¹ quantum Hall systems,¹² and d-wave superconductors,¹³ and has been under intensive study. For these problems, the chiral symmetry of the Hamiltonian, which means the energy eigenvalues are symmetric around the zero point, plays an important role. In contrast, the chiral symmetry is not important in our analysis since we consider energies in the vicinity of the Fermi level and therefore far from the zero energy.

We show below that this model can be mapped onto the conventional nonlinear model with the unitary symmetry. As the chiral symmetry is not important, this is a natural result from the viewpoint of the symmetry considerations. At the same time, the interaction with the spin changes the classical diffusion coefficient D entering the model. We obtain somewhat different expressions for the single-particle lifetime and the transport time as compared to the RMF model without spin. The spin degrees of freedom do not change the conventional form of the current and density correlation functions. As a spin dependent quantity, a spin correlation function is calculated.

II. SELF-CONSISTENT BORN APPROXIMATION

Before deriving the model let us demonstrate how one can calculate the one-particle and transport lifetimes using the Dirac representation for the Hamiltonian H , Eq.(2). We consider a two-dimensional system with the gauge field $A(r)$ described by the Hamiltonian H , Eqs.(1) and (2). This Hamiltonian can be represented as the square of the Dirac operator (we put below $c = 1$)

$$H = \frac{2}{2m} = H_0 + B_3 B_3(r); \quad (3)$$

$$= [\not{\partial} - eA(r)]; \quad (4)$$

We assume that the distribution of the gauge field $A(r)$ is Gaussian with the correlations

$$\langle A_i(r) A_j(r^0) \rangle = \frac{2m^2}{e^2} \frac{d^2 q}{(2)^2} V_{ij}(q) e^{iq \cdot (r - r^0)}; \quad (5)$$

$$V_{ij}(q) = \frac{v_F^2}{q^2 + p_F^2} \delta_{ij} - \frac{q_i q_j}{q^2}; \quad (6)$$

where v_F characterizes the strength of the disorder and p_F is the Fermi momentum. The limit $p_F = 0$ corresponds to

a δ -correlated magnetic field. Nonzero values of p_F describe a screening and we keep below an arbitrary value of p_F .

Our main idea for considering the spin effects in the random magnetic field problem is to represent Green functions $G_E^{R,A}$

$$G_E^{R,A} = \frac{1}{E - H - i} \quad (7)$$

of the Hamiltonian H , Eqs. (1) and (2), in terms of the Green functions $g_k^{R,A}$ of the Dirac Hamiltonian

$$g_k^{R,A} = \frac{1}{k - i}; \quad (8)$$

Using the relation

$$G_E^{R,A} = \frac{m}{k} g_k^{R,A} g_k^{A,R}; \quad (9)$$

where $k = (2mE)^{1/2}$ is actually the Fermi momentum, we achieve this goal.

The Dirac Hamiltonian is linear in the gauge field $A(r)$ and the ensemble averaging can be performed easily. On the other hand, the usual Hamiltonian (1) includes the square of the gauge field, which makes the averaging procedure more difficult. At the same time, just neglecting the term A^2 may be dangerous because this violates the gauge invariance. In our case, we can keep the gauge invariance at any step of calculations.

In order to demonstrate how our scheme works we calculate first the average Green functions $g_k^{R,A}$ using the well known self-consistent Born approximation. Summing only ladder diagrams in the standard way¹⁴ we obtain for the Green function

$$G_k^{R,A}(p) = \frac{1}{k - i - \Sigma_k^{R,A}(p)}; \quad (10)$$

where the self-energy $\Sigma_k(p)$ should be found from the equation

$$\Sigma_k^{R,A}(p) = 2im^2 \sum_{i,j} \frac{d^2 q}{(2)^2} V_{ij}(p - q) \frac{1}{i - i - \Sigma_k^{R,A}(q)}; \quad (11)$$

In Eqs.(10) and (11), p and q are momenta. Using the usual assumption that disorder is weak one can obtain easily

$$G_k^{R,A}(p) = \frac{1}{k - p - \frac{i}{8E_F}(k + p)} \quad (12)$$

$$\frac{1}{2mE} \frac{k + p}{\frac{p^2}{2m} - \frac{i}{2}}; \quad (13)$$

where τ is the single-particle lifetime specified below. Using Eq.(9), we extract the Green function

$$G_E^{R;A}(\mathbf{p}) = \frac{1}{E - \frac{\mathbf{p}^2}{2m} - \frac{i}{2}}; \quad (14)$$

This is the usual form of the Green functions. So, we conclude that the interaction of the magnetic spin does not change the form of the Green functions.

At the same time, the expression of the single-particle lifetime differs from that for spinless particles. For short-range disorder $(E_F)^{-1}$ the solution of Eq.(11) leads to the following expression for the single particle lifetime:

$$\frac{1}{\tau} = \frac{Z}{E_F} \int_0^{\frac{Z}{2}} \frac{d}{2} \frac{1}{\sin^2 \frac{Z}{2} + \frac{Z^2}{4}} \quad (15)$$

$$\frac{2 E_F}{Z}; \quad (16)$$

In contrast to the corresponding result for the model without spin^{3,5} a factor $\cos^2(\frac{Z}{2})$ in the integrand is absent. However, in the limit of small Z , integration over Z in Eq.(15) leads to the same result as for the spinless problem.

In the limit of long-range disorder $(E_F)^{-1}$, we obtain solving Eq.(11) a more complicated expression

$$\frac{1}{\tau} = \frac{2 E_F}{Z} \int_0^{\frac{Z}{2}} \frac{d}{2} \frac{1}{\sin^2 \frac{Z}{2} + \frac{Z^2}{4}} \quad (17)$$

$$4E_F - \ln \frac{2}{1-Z^2}; \quad (18)$$

Again, the integrand in Eq.(17) differs from the corresponding integrand of the spinless problem by the absence of $\cos^2(\frac{Z}{2})$ in the integrand. This changes the final result and we obtain a single-particle lifetime which has an additional factor $1-Z^2$ as compared to the corresponding result for the spinless problem.

Due to the long range correlations of the random field the transport time τ_{tr} entering the classical diffusion coefficient D differs from the single particle time τ . By considering the nonsingular corrections as explained in Ref. 3 one comes to the renormalization

$$\frac{1}{\tau_{tr}} = \frac{1}{\tau} - \frac{1}{(1)}; \quad (19)$$

where (1) can be obtained by inserting the additional factor \cos in the integrands in Eqs.(15) and (17). For the model without spin one has $1/\tau_{tr} = E_F^3$ and the diffusion constant is given by $D = v_F^2 \tau_{tr} = 2$. In the present case, one comes to the following expression for $1/\tau_{tr}$ [again, the factor $\cos^2(\frac{Z}{2})$ is absent in the integrand]

$$\frac{1}{\tau_{tr}} = \frac{Z}{E_F} \int_0^{\frac{Z}{2}} \frac{d}{2} \frac{1}{\sin^2 \frac{Z}{2}} (1 - \cos Z) \quad (20)$$

$$= 2 E_F;$$

The diffusion constant D is related to transport time τ_{tr} in the usual way

$$D = \frac{v_F^2 \tau_{tr}}{2}; \quad (21)$$

This result shows that by taking into account spin, we get a transport time which is one half of the usual one. This difference can be considered as a spin effect. Remarkably, the orbital and spin scattering give equal contributions to the resistivity determined by $1/\tau_{tr}$. This effect is not trivial and is obtained only after integration over Z in Eq.(20) and in the corresponding equation for the spinless problem. It is specific for two dimensions.

III. SUPERSYMMETRIC NONLINEAR MODEL

In order to consider interference effects and localization one should consider either more complicated diagrams or derive a nonlinear model. Both the methods have been used for the spinless problem.^{15,3,5} For the present problem we want to use the supersymmetry technique and to derive a supermatrix model. We use the notation and conventions of Ref. 6 in the following calculation.

As we have seen, we need the Green functions $g_k^{R;A}$ and $g_k^{R;A}$ in order to calculate the Green functions $G_E^{R;A}$. We define the following generating function to calculate the product of the Green's function as

$$Z(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{t}) = \int \mathcal{D} \mathbf{L} \mathcal{D} \mathbf{L}^* e^{-L}; \quad (22)$$

$$L = \int d^2 r (x) [H_0 + e A(x)] (x); \quad (23)$$

where

$$H_0 = \int d^2 r (k + \frac{\mathbf{t}^+}{2}); \quad (24)$$

k denotes the Fermi momentum and \mathbf{t}^+ is related to the energy difference as $\mathbf{t}^+ = v_F \mathbf{t}$. The matrices \mathbf{L} and \mathbf{L}^* are defined as

$$\mathbf{L} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{L}_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{L}_2 \end{pmatrix}; \quad (25)$$

$$\mathbf{L}^* = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}; \quad (26)$$

Note that \mathbf{L}_1 are the (Pauli) matrices in the spin space, \mathbf{L}_2 in the time-reversal space and \mathbf{L} is a matrix that reflects $+$ and $-$. The supervector \mathbf{L} contains 32 components corresponding to fermion/boson, advanced/retarded, time-reversal multiplication, spin degrees of freedom, and $+/ -$ structure.

The calculation is done in a similar way as that for the model without spin. After the ensemble averaging and the Hubbard-Stratonovitch transformation, the generating function can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \hbar Z(k; \tau) i = & \int_0^{\tau} DQ \exp \left[\frac{1}{2} \text{str} \ln \Theta \right] i H_0(r^0) - 2m^2 \sum_{i,j} V_{ij}(r^0) \int_0^{\tau} Q(r; r^0) j A \\ & - \frac{m^2}{2} \sum_{i,j} \int_0^{\tau} d^2 r d^2 r^0 V_{ij}(r^0) \text{str} Q(r; r^0) \int_0^{\tau} Q(r^0; r) j^5 ; \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where Q is a 32×32 supermatrix and str denotes the supertrace.

The saddle-point equation is solved by

$$Q^{(0)}(p) = \frac{i}{p^2 + k + \frac{i}{8E_F}(k + p)}; \quad (28)$$

which is essentially the same as Eq.(12). The single-particle lifetime has already been obtained above.

Now let us turn to the discussion of the saddle-point manifold. For $\tau = 0$, the generating function is invariant under the transformation $\tau \rightarrow \tau + T$, where the matrix T obeys the following constraints:

$$T T^\dagger = 1; \quad (29)$$

$$T_{1,2} T_{1,2}^\dagger = 1; \quad (30)$$

The first equation is the unitarity condition, whereas the second one specifies the structure in the spin space. Using these conditions we obtain the saddle-point manifold. It can be parametrized as

$$Q = T Q^{(0)} T; \quad (31)$$

$$T = \frac{1 - iP}{1 + iP}^{1/2}; \quad (32)$$

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & B \\ B^\dagger & 0 \end{pmatrix}; \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} B^{(++)} & B^{(+)} \\ B^{(+)} & B^{(0)} \end{pmatrix}; \quad (33)$$

This block form of the matrix B reflects the structure in $+/$ space. This matrix satisfies $[B;_{1,2}] = 0$ in addition to the usual condition $B = K B K$. It means that $B^{(++)}$ and $B^{(0)}$ are proportional to the unit matrix in spin space and $B^{(+)}$ and $B^{(-)}$ are proportional to σ_3 . This result shows that if we consider the generating function for the Dirac Hamiltonian, only the mode $B^{(++)}$ is left gapless and we come to the usual unitary model. The structure in $+/$ space makes the result more complicated. We have four gapless modes and they equally contribute to the physical quantities as we see below.

Having specified the saddle-point manifold, we derive the free energy describing gapless modes. Again, this calculation resembles that for the spinless case. In addition to the usual massless mode $P(R)$, we need to take into account soft massive modes $P(R; n)$ which depend on the direction vector of the Fermi momentum ($n = p/\bar{p}$). The saddle-point manifold is parametrized as Eq.(31) and the matrix T is decomposed as

$$T(R; n) = U(R) V(R; n); \quad (34)$$

The supermatrices U and V parametrize the massless modes and the soft massive modes respectively. They are expressed as Eq.(32) and expanded in the supermatrix P . For the soft massive modes, the dependence of the supermatrices on n is treated in the Fourier-transformed space as

$$P(R; n) = \sum_m P(R; m) e^{im\phi}; \quad (35)$$

where ϕ is the polar angle of the vector n . The m th lifetime $\tau^{(m)}$ which is associated with each modes is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{k}{8E_F \tau^{(m)}} (1 + n) \\ & = 2m^2 \sum_{i,j} \int_0^{\tau} \frac{d^2 q}{(2\tau)^2} V_{ij}(p - q) \int_0^{\tau} Q^{(0)}(p) j e^{im\phi}; \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

$\tau^{(0)}$ corresponds to the single-particle lifetime. We will see that these nonzero-harmonics modes renormalize the transport time and, as a result, one comes to Eq.(19). Details are presented in Ref. 5. Performing the gradient expansion and integrating out the soft massive modes we obtain the nonlinear model

$$F = \frac{1}{16} \int d^2 r \text{str} D [r Q(r)]^2 + 2i \int Q(r); \quad (37)$$

where $Q(r) = U(r) U^\dagger(r)$ and $\rho = m/2$ is the density of states. The diffusion constant D is given by Eq.(21) and the transport time τ_{tr} is introduced in Eq.(20).

The form of the free energy F is the same as for the model without spin but the dependence of the diffusion coefficient D on the correlations of the magnetic field is somewhat different. We note that an additional term derived in Ref. 5 can also be present in our model. However, this term appears at longer correlations of the magnetic field and we will not consider it in this paper.

Due to the spin degrees of freedom, the 32×32 supermatrix Q has a more complicated structure than usual. However, we will show below, the renormalization properties show this model falls into the usual unitary class. We show the results for the conductivity and the current correlation function. They can be calculated by using the following contraction rules for the perturbative calculations as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{hstrX P (r)Y P (r}^0\text{)}i_F = & \frac{1}{16} (r;r^0) \sum_{=0}^{X^3} [\text{str X str Y str X str Y} \\ & + \text{str X str Y str X str Y} \\ & + \text{str }_3\text{X str }_3\text{Y str }_3\text{X str }_3\text{Y} \\ & \text{str }_3\text{X str }_3\text{Y} + \text{str }_3\text{X str }_3\text{Y} \\ & + (X ! _3X ; Y ! _3Y)]; \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{hstrX P (r)strY P (r}^0\text{)}i_F = & \frac{1}{8} (r;r^0) \sum_{=0}^{X^3} \text{str (X Y X Y + X Y X Y} \\ & + _3\text{X }_3\text{Y }_3\text{X }_3\text{Y }_3\text{X }_3\text{Y + }_3\text{X }_3\text{Y} \\ & + (Y ! Y)); \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

where X and Y are arbitrary 32×32 matrices which commute with $_3$ and $(x;y)$ is the diffusion propagator

$$(r;r^0) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{=0}^Z \frac{d^2 q}{(2)^2 D q^2} \frac{1}{i!} e^{iq(r-r^0)}; \quad (40)$$

At first glance, the above expressions of the contraction rules look quite different from the usual ones. However, if we assume that X and Y do not have any spin structure, we obtain the standard contraction rules. Therefore, we will get the usual unitary results for spin-independent quantities. We show for instance the results of the conductivity and the current correlation function. The conductivity is defined as

$$i_{ij}(!) = \frac{e^2}{2} R_{ij}(k=0;!); \quad (41)$$

where $R_{ij}(k;!)$ is the Fourier-transform of the correlation function

$$R_{ij}(r;r^0;!)= \sum_{=0}^D \text{tr } \hat{r}^i G_E^A \text{ }_{!=2} (r;r^0) \hat{r}^j G_{E+!=2}^R (r^0;r); \quad (42)$$

where $\hat{r} = i r_{\times m}$ is the velocity operator. In the two-loop approximation we obtain

$$i_{ij}(!) = \sigma_0 i_{ij} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2^2} \frac{2}{d} \sum_{=0}^Z \frac{d^d q}{D q^2} \frac{1}{i!} \right)^2; \quad (43)$$

where $\sigma_0 = 2e^2/D$ is the classical conductivity. This is the same expression as the one presented in Ref. 5 and is just the usual unitary result.

The current correlation function which is defined as

$$I_{ij}(r;r^0;!)= hJ_i(r;E \text{ }_{!=2})J_j(r^0;E+!=2)i; \quad (44)$$

$$\begin{aligned} J_i(r;E) = & \frac{ie}{4} \lim_{r^0 \rightarrow r} \hat{r}^i_r - \hat{r}^i_{r^0} \\ & \text{tr } G_E^R(r;r^0) - G_E^A(r;r^0); \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

can be written in a Fourier-transformed form in the leading order as

$$I_{ij}(q;!)= \frac{2e^2}{3} i_{ij} \frac{q_i q_j}{q^2} \ln(qL_!); \quad (46)$$

where $L_! = (D=!)^{1=2}$. This result is four times larger than the corresponding result of Ref. 16. This difference is due to the spin degrees of freedom. We see that all the expressions for the spinless quantities are just the results for the unitary ensemble.

For the present model, we can introduce in addition spin correlation functions that could not exist for models without spin. As an example, we define a correlation function which is a direct extension of the density-density correlation function widely used in theory of localization⁶

$$\begin{aligned} T_{ij}(q;!)= & i \sum_{=0}^Z \frac{dE}{2} \sum_{=0}^Z \frac{d^2 p}{(2)^2} (n(E) - n(E+!)) \\ & \text{tr } i G_E^R(p) j G_E^A \text{ }_{!=} (p-q) \\ & + n(E) \text{tr } i G_{E+!}^R(p+q) j G_E^R(p) \\ & \text{tr } i G_E^A(p) j G_E^A \text{ }_{!=} (p-q); \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

where $n(E)$ is the Fermi distribution function and $i,j=0;1;2;3$ ($_0=1$). The component $T_{00}(q;!)$ gives the conventional density-density correlation function. We refer to Appendix for details of the calculation and obtain

$$T_{ij}(q;!)= \begin{cases} 2 \frac{D q^2}{D q^2 i!} & \text{for } i=j=0;3; \\ 2 & \text{for } i=j=1;2; \end{cases} \quad (48)$$

We find the usual result for the density correlation function. Since we do not take any electron interaction into account, this can be considered a natural result. The same diffusive form appears for T_{33} . This diffusion contribution comes from the mixing of the $+/$ space.

In conclusion, we have discussed spin effects for the two-dimensional random magnetic field model. We suggested to take into account spin degrees of freedom writing the Dirac Hamiltonian instead of the initial Hamiltonian for electrons with spin, which is possible for the model of free electrons. The interaction of the magnetic field with spin is not smaller than its effect on the orbital motion. Moreover, in a homogeneous field the Zeeman splitting is equal to the distance between the Landau levels.

We derived a nonlinear supermatrix model that turned out to be a conventional model with the unitary symmetry. However, the single particle lifetime and the diffusion coefficient differ from their values for the spinless particles. Remarkably, the transport time and, correspondingly, the diffusion coefficient are two times smaller than those for the spinless problem. This means that the orbital and spin scattering equally contribute to resistivity. The conductivity and the current-current correlation functions take the conventional form for the unitary class. The form of the spin-spin correlation function is the similar to that of the density-density correlation function. Our results obtained by the supersymmetry method can be well reproduced using the diagrammatic methods.

Finally, we mention two possible extensions of our model. First, our analysis is restricted to the model with fixed g factor $g = 2$. The advantage to introduce the Dirac Hamiltonian was that the spin degrees of freedom is taken into account naturally. The square of the Dirac Hamiltonian without any parameter gives Eq.(3) with fixed g factor. On the other hand, it is well known that the g factor can take different value for realistic materials. Unfortunately, it is difficult to extend our approach directly to the case of a different g factor. However, we hope that our results shed some light on a possible behavior of more realistic systems.

Second interesting problem is the case of a nonzero average magnetic field. In this case, the Zeeman splitting causes the reformation of the Landau levels and nontrivial results may be expected. For spinful electrons, in addition to the perpendicular magnetic field, the parallel field is also relevant even for the two-dimensional system. In this paper, we have discussed a two-dimensional Hamiltonian. The Dirac Hamiltonian does not include the Pauli matrix σ_3 and only the perpendicular magnetic field enters the square of the Dirac Hamiltonian [Eq.(3)]. If we consider the three-dimensional Hamiltonian, we can include the magnetic field for all directions. Even if the diffusion process is two-dimensional, we may need to treat the one-electron states as three-dimensional in that case. It will be a subject of a future work.

We acknowledge the financial support of the Sonderforschungsbereich 237. It would like to thank G. Schwiete for discussions and reading the manuscript.

APPENDIX A: CALCULATION OF THE SPIN CORRELATION FUNCTION

We consider the function

$$\text{tr } iG_E^R(r; r^0) jG_E^A(r^0; r); \quad (\text{A } 1)$$

to calculate the spin correlation function. For the product of the Green functions, we express it in the functional integral form as

$$\begin{aligned} & \int \mathcal{D} \psi \mathcal{D} \bar{\psi} \exp \left[- \int d^2 r \bar{\psi} (i \not{\partial} - E) \psi \right] \\ & = \frac{4}{V_F^2} \int \mathcal{D} \psi \mathcal{D} \bar{\psi} \exp \left[- \int d^2 r \bar{\psi} (i \not{\partial} - E) \psi \right] \\ & \quad \times \exp \left[- \int d^2 r \bar{\psi} (i \not{\partial} - E) \psi \right]; \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A } 2)$$

where ψ , $\bar{\psi}$, and ψ are spin indices, 1 and 2 denote the advanced and retarded channel, + and - the + / - space, and α and β are other indices. No summation is implied for α and β . After introducing the auxiliary field Q and taking the contraction of ψ in two possible ways, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{V_F^2} \int \mathcal{D} \psi \mathcal{D} \bar{\psi} \exp \left[- \int d^2 r \bar{\psi} (i \not{\partial} - E) \psi \right] \\ & \quad \times \exp \left[- \int d^2 r \bar{\psi} (i \not{\partial} - E) \psi \right] \\ & \quad \times \exp \left[- \int d^2 r \bar{\psi} (i \not{\partial} - E) \psi \right]; \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A } 3)$$

where

$$C = \frac{k_1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{3}{2} \frac{1}{2}; \quad (\text{A } 4)$$

At the leading order, the Green's function g is given in the Fourier-transformed space in terms of the relative coordinates as

$$g(R; p) = \frac{i}{p + \frac{1}{8E_F} (p + p) Q(R)}; \quad (\text{A } 5)$$

and $Q(R)$ is expanded in terms of $P(R)$.

Substituting g to the first term of Eq.(A 3), we have leading contribution

$$\int \mathcal{D} \psi \mathcal{D} \bar{\psi} \exp \left[- \int d^2 r \bar{\psi} (i \not{\partial} - E) \psi \right] \times \exp \left[- \int d^2 r \bar{\psi} (i \not{\partial} - E) \psi \right]; \quad (\text{A } 6)$$

The matrix P has the structure

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} P^{++} & P^{+-} \\ P^{-+} & P^{--} \end{pmatrix}; \quad (\text{A } 7)$$

in $+/$ space. $P^{(++)}$ and $P^{(-)}$ are proportional to ϕ_0 in spin space and $P^{(+)}$ and $P^{(-)}$ are proportional to ϕ_3 . Using this fact and the contraction rule, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i0} \sum_{j0} \sum_D \text{str} C_+ P^{(++)}(r) C_- P^{(++)}(r^0) \\
& + \sum_D \text{str} C_+ P^{(-)}(r) C_- P^{(-)}(r^0) \\
& + \sum_{i3} \sum_{j3} \sum_D \text{str} C_+ P^{(+)}(r) C_- P^{(+)}(r^0) \\
& + \sum_D \text{str} C_+ P^{(-)}(r) C_- P^{(-)}(r^0) \\
& = 4 \left(\sum_{i0} \sum_{j0} + \sum_{i3} \sum_{j3} \right) \sum_Z \frac{d^2 q}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{1}{D q^2} \frac{1}{i!} e^{iq(r-r^0)} : (A8)
\end{aligned}$$

The contribution comes from the second term of Eq.(A3) is small and is neglected.

We use this result for the first term of Eq.(47). Substituting the Green's function (14) to the second term of Eq.(47), we find $2 \sum_{ij}$. Combining these results, we finally obtain Eq.(48).

¹ V. Kalmeyer and S.-C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. B 46, 9889 (1992); B. I. Halperin, P. A. Lee and N. Read, *ibid.* 47, 7312 (1993).

² M. Ando, A. Endo, S. Katsumoto, and Y. Iye, Physica B 284-288, 1900 (2000).

- ³ A. G. Aronov, A. D. Mirlin, and P. Wölfle, Phys. Rev. B 49, 16609 (1994).
- ⁴ D. Taras-Semchuk and K. B. Efetov, Phys. Rev. Lett. 85, 1060 (2000). See also; A. D. Mirlin, and P. Wölfle, *ibid.* 86, 3688 (2001); D. Taras-Semchuk and K. B. Efetov, *ibid.* 86, 3689 (2001).
- ⁵ D. Taras-Semchuk and K. B. Efetov, Phys. Rev. B 64, 115301 (2001).
- ⁶ K. Efetov, Adv. Phys. 32, 53 (1983); Supersymmetry in Disorder and Chaos (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997).
- ⁷ B. A. Muzikantskii and D. E. Khmelnitskii, Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Theo. Fiz. 62 68 (1995) [JETP Lett. 62 76 (1995)].
- ⁸ L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshits, Quantum Mechanics (Pergamon, London, 1959)
- ⁹ S. Maki and H. Fukuyama, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 50 2516 (1981); H. Fukuyama, in Electron-Electron Interaction in Disordered Systems, edited by A. L. Efros and M. Pollak (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1985).
- ¹⁰ B. L. Altshuler and A. G. Aronov, in Electron-Electron Interaction in Disordered Systems, edited by A. L. Efros and M. Pollak (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1985).
- ¹¹ E. Fradkin, Phys. Rev. B 33, 3257 (1986).
- ¹² A. W. W. Ludwig, M. P. A. Fisher, R. Shankar, and G. Grinstein, Phys. Rev. B 50, 7526 (1994).
- ¹³ For a review; A. Altland, B. D. Simons, and M. R. Zirnbauer, Phys. Rep. 359, 283 (2002).
- ¹⁴ A. A. Abrikosov, L. P. Gor'kov, and I. E. Dzyaloshinskii, Methods of quantum field theory in statistical physics (Prentice Hall, New York, 1963).
- ¹⁵ P. Wölfle and R. N. Bhatt, Phys. Rev. B 30, 3542 (1984).
- ¹⁶ I. V. Gomyi, A. D. Mirlin, and P. Wölfle, Phys. Rev. B 64, 115403 (2001).