

# Fluctuation of the Correlation Dimension and the Inverse Participation Number at the Anderson Transition

Imre Varga

*Fachbereich Physik, Philipps-Universität Marburg, Renthof 6, D-35032 Marburg, Germany and  
Elméleti Fizika Tanszék, Budapesti Műszaki és Gazdaságtudományi Egyetem, H-1521 Budapest, Hungary*  
(Dated: March 22, 2022)

The distribution of the correlation dimension in a power law band random matrix model having critical, i.e. multifractal, eigenstates is numerically investigated. It is shown that their probability distribution function has a fixed point as the system size is varied exactly at a value obtained from the scaling properties of the typical value of the inverse participation number. Therefore the state-to-state fluctuation of the correlation dimension is tightly linked to the scaling properties of the joint probability distribution of the eigenstates.

PACS numbers: 72.15.Rn, 71.30.+h, 05.45.-a, 05.45.Df

It is already well established [1, 2, 3] that the eigenstates at the localization–delocalization transition driven by disorder are multifractals characterized by a set of generalized dimensions,  $D_q$ . This is reflected both in the statistical properties of each eigenstate and in the joint probability distribution of the eigenvector components. In the first case the multifractal analysis is performed on each eigenstate using the usual box–counting algorithm, while in the second case the scaling properties of the distribution function are analyzed.

The generalized dimensions are associated to the scaling of the  $q$ th moment of the eigenstates,  $\psi_\alpha(\mathbf{r})$ . These moments are also termed as generalized inverse participation numbers [1, 2]

$$I_q = \left\langle \int d^d r |\psi_\alpha(\mathbf{r})|^{2q} \right\rangle_\alpha \sim L^{-D_q(q-1)}, \quad (1)$$

where  $L$  is the linear dimension of the system. The inverse of  $I_2$ , for example, roughly equals the number of nonzero wave function components, therefore it is a good and widely accepted measure of the extension of the states. For delocalized states  $I_2 \sim 1/N$ , while for localized ones  $I_2 \sim O(1)$ . At criticality it scales with  $L$  with exponent  $D_2$  (1). This scaling may be found for each state  $\psi_\alpha(\mathbf{r})$  but then the corresponding exponents fluctuate.

Another property of multifractality is related to the probability overlap of eigenstates with energy separation substantially exceeding the mean level separation. In particular  $D_2$  describes these density correlations: hence the name of correlation dimension. It has been shown that for multifractal eigenstates these correlations decay slowly [4] no matter how sparse these states are. The role of  $D_2$  is even more important as it has been related to the level compressibility at criticality [5, 6] that is a remarkable relation that has been corroborated at least for the case of *weak* multifractality.

The multifractal properties of the wave functions at criticality also shows up in the anomalous spreading of a wave packet, where the value of  $D_2$  plays an essential

role [7].

The importance of the generalized dimensions and especially of  $D_2$  therefore is obviously hard to overestimate. This is the reason why it came as a surprise when in [8] the authors demonstrated that the correlation dimension,  $D_2$ , has a relatively broad distribution even with increasing systems size of a three dimensional Anderson model. The authors concluded that this broadness remains in the thermodynamic limit and therefore there is no unique value of  $D_2$  in this limit. Such a statement would imply serious objections against one–parameter scaling theory which is corroborated by many other techniques [2]. Based on numerical simulations on a random matrix model having eigenstates that exhibit multifractality, however, it has been shown in [9, 10] that the fluctuations of  $I_2$  can indeed be characterized by a universal probability distribution function (PDF),  $\Pi(I_2)$  once  $I_2$  is normalized with the typical value,  $\tilde{I}_2 = I_2/I_2^{typ}$ , where  $I_2^{typ} = \exp\langle \ln I_2 \rangle$ :

$$\tilde{\Pi}(\ln \tilde{I}_2) = \Pi_N(\ln I_2/I_2^{typ}). \quad (2)$$

So the PDFs are simply horizontally shifted by

$$\ln I_2^{typ} = \langle \ln I_2 \rangle \propto \tilde{D}_2 \ln N \quad (3)$$

to put on top of each other and obtain the universal curve of  $\tilde{\Pi}(\ln \tilde{I}_2)$  showing that there is indeed a unique value of  $\tilde{D}_2$  to characterize the scaling of  $I_2$ . In the present work we wish to reconcile the apparent contradiction existing about the fluctuations of the correlation dimension  $D_2$  and to show how to correct the misinterpretation of [8] and obtain results that are compatible with [9, 10].

To this end we performed numerical simulations on the power law band random matrix ensemble that has been recently intensively investigated [9, 10, 11, 12]. This model is more suitable for a quantitative analysis since it allows to obtain a wider range of linear extension ( $N = L$ ) of the system as compared to the usual Anderson model defined over an  $N = L^3$  lattice of linear size  $L$ . Moreover, the model is capable to show many of the features of the traditional Anderson transition [2, 6, 12]. We




FIG. 1: Distribution function of the inverse participation number  $\Pi(\ln I_2)$  vs the rescaled value of  $\ln(I_2/I_2^{typ})$  for different matrix sizes  $N$ . Open (filled) symbols correspond to  $\beta = 1$  ( $\beta = 2$ ). The inset shows the scaling of the typical value,  $\ln I_2^{typ} = \langle \ln I_2 \rangle$  vs  $\ln(N)$ .

will show that indeed the PDF of the correlation dimension of the states is a broad function which eventually has a fixed point at a value very close to  $\tilde{D}_2$  obtained from the scaling of  $I_2^{typ}$ . Moreover, from the average value,  $\langle D_2 \rangle$ , one can extract the same answer as well.

The elements in these ensembles of  $N \times N$  complex hermitian matrices are Gaussian distributed random variables with zero mean,  $\langle H_{i,j} \rangle = 0$ , and a variance

$$\langle (H_{i,j})^2 \rangle = [1 + (|i - j|/b)^2]^{-1} \times \begin{cases} 1/2, & i \neq j \\ 1/\beta, & i = j \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

where  $\beta = 1$  or  $2$  depending on the global symmetry of the system. In the presence of time reversal symmetry,  $\beta = 1$ , and the matrices are real symmetric, in its absence,  $\beta = 2$ . The parameter  $b$  is an effective bandwidth that serves as a continuous control parameter over a whole line of criticality [6]. In this work we set  $b = 1$  as this proves to give the best convergence towards a scale invariant distribution function [9]. However, at the end we will give the  $b$ -dependence of the results as well.

The states have been obtained using standard diagonalization routines for the cases of  $N = 128, \dots, 2048$ . The properties of the states in the vicinity of the middle of the band have been collected. We chose 25% of the states around  $E = 0$ , and verified that by narrowing this energy window the results do not alter but obviously the statistics becomes worse.

Each individual eigenstate may show scaling with different exponents  $D_2$ . On the other hand the distribution of the IPN,  $I_2 \sim N^{D_2}$ , of the eigenstates shows universal scaling properties [2], thus a relation between these properties is expected. The distribution function of  $D_2$  can be connected to that of the  $I_2$  (2) as

$$\mathcal{P}_N(D_2) dD_2 = \Pi_N(I_2) dI_2 \quad (5)$$




FIG. 2: Distribution function of the correlation dimension  $\mathcal{P}(D_2)$  for the random matrix model with different matrix sizes  $N$  for the case of conserved time reversal symmetry,  $\beta = 1$ .

which yields

$$\mathcal{P}_N(D_2) = \Pi_N(N^{D_2}) N^{D_2} \ln(N). \quad (6)$$

We expect the distribution of  $D_2$  to tend to a universal distribution as well as that of  $I_2$ . Evers and Mirlin [9] have proved that in particular  $I_2$  is a self-averaging quantity and numerically confirmed that for the case of the present model. The same has been shown for the case of the Anderson model, too [3, 10]. Therefore as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  we expect that the distribution

$$\mathcal{P}_N(D_2) \rightarrow \delta(D_2 - \tilde{D}_2). \quad (7)$$

This is in direct contradiction to the conclusions of [8].

Furthermore using Eq. (6) for  $\mathcal{P}(D_2)$  and Eq. (3) we can readily derive expressions of the mean value and the variance of  $D_2$  in relation to the mean value and variance value of  $\ln I_2$  as

$$\langle D_2 \rangle - \tilde{D}_2 = \frac{\text{const}}{\ln N} \rightarrow 0 \quad (8)$$

and

$$\text{var}(D_2) = \frac{\text{var}(\ln I_2)}{(\ln N)^2} \rightarrow 0, \quad (9)$$

where the convergence to zero for the variance is ensured by [10, 11]

$$\text{var}(\ln I_2) = \sigma_\infty - aN^{-y}, \quad (10)$$

with the irrelevant scaling  $y = \tilde{D}_2/(2\beta) > 0$  and also  $a > 0$  and  $\sigma_\infty > 0$ . These logarithmic convergences, Eqs. (8) and (9), seem to be too difficult to detect for the case of the traditional Anderson model [8], even though, Ref. [10, 11] showed the scaling (10) very clearly.




FIG. 3: Distribution function of the correlation dimension  $\mathcal{P}(D_2)$  for the random matrix model with different matrix sizes  $N$  for the case of broken time reversal symmetry,  $\beta = 2$ .

In Fig. 1 first we show that indeed the scaling of the PDF  $\Pi_N(\ln I_2)$  holds and obtain the value of  $\tilde{D}_2$  from the typical value,  $\langle \ln I_2 \rangle$  for both  $\beta = 1$  and 2. Their values are listed in Table I. As a next step we turn to the PDF of the correlation dimension,  $D_2$ . The correlation dimension of the individual eigenstates have been obtained using the standard box-counting algorithm [1]. In Figs. 2 and 3 we show how  $\mathcal{P}(D_2)$  evolves by doubling  $N$ . These figures give the same information as Fig. 3 of [8] for the case of the power law band random matrix ensemble. By increasing  $N$  the distribution gets narrower, moreover, there is a fixed point right in the interval of  $0.7 < D_2 < 0.8$  for  $\beta = 1$  and at  $0.85 < D_2 < 0.9$  for  $\beta = 2$ . In the insets of both figures we plot this region enlarged in a semi-log plot. The fixed point clearly appears at  $D_2^* \approx 0.75$  for  $\beta = 1$  and  $D_2^* \approx 0.87$  for  $\beta = 2$ . The first value is precisely the one obtained via the scaling of the typical value  $\langle \ln I_2 \rangle$  in [9] and is close to our numerical results in Fig. 1.

We argue that due to the self-averaging property of  $I_2$  [9]  $\mathcal{P}(D_2)$  should tend to a  $\delta$ -function so for finite  $N, N'$  there should be a fixed point in the distribution function,

$$\mathcal{P}_N(D_2^*) = \mathcal{P}_{N'}(D_2^*), \quad (11)$$

provided  $D_2^*$  falls within the set of  $D_2$ 's of the eigenstates. This ensures that  $D_2^* = \tilde{D}_2$  is the unique value of the correlation dimension at  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . Moreover it is also the average value,  $\langle D_2 \rangle$  in this limit (8). The convergence of  $\langle D_2 \rangle$  towards  $D_2$  is given in Fig. 4. The value of  $\langle D_2 \rangle$  extracted from this fit together with the other estimates of  $D_2$  are listed in Table I. The error bars characterize the goodness of the linear fits as depicted in Figs. 1 and 4. The different approaches give slightly different values, some of them coincide within a few percent difference. We attribute the discrepancies to possible finite size ef-




FIG. 4: Scaling of the mean value of the correlation dimension as  $\langle D_2 \rangle \ln(N)$  vs  $\ln(N)$ . The lines are linear fits to the data. According to (8) the slope corresponds to  $\tilde{D}_2$  describing the scaling of  $\ln I_2^{typ}$ .

TABLE I: Correlation dimensions obtained using different approaches

	$\beta = 1$	$\beta = 2$
$\tilde{D}_2$	$0.7036 \pm 0.0024$	$0.8576 \pm 0.0018$
$\langle D_2 \rangle$	$0.7598 \pm 0.0005$	$0.9046 \pm 0.0011$
$D_2^*$	$0.7519 \pm 0.0004$	$0.8781 \pm 0.0014$

fects and to the fact that the number of samples has not been large enough. For conserved time reversal symmetry,  $\beta = 1$ , we observe a coincidence between our  $\langle D_2 \rangle$  and  $D_2^*$  values, together with the one obtained by [9] over a larger ensemble of samples and a wider range of matrix size. All the values from different estimates seem to be within a range of 1–8% difference. Therefore we may conclude that despite the relatively large state-to-state fluctuations of the correlation dimension depicted in a wide PDF of  $\mathcal{P}(D_2)$  in Figs. 2 and 3 one can still define a unique value of  $D_2$  that is characteristic to the critical point.

Let us apply a similar argument to the results presented in Ref. [8]. Inspecting Fig. 3 of that work closely, contrary to what is claimed there, the distribution does not show a universal, broad form but rather gets more and more peaked as  $N$  increases. Even the authors admit a very large drop of  $\mathcal{P}(D_2)$  in the interval of  $1.5 < D_2 < 2.0$  that apparently is system size dependent. One may find a similar fixed point as in our Figures 1 and 2 at around  $D_2^* \approx 1.55$ . This value is consistent with most of the presently known estimates of the correlation dimension calculated using different methods and listed in [8]. It is, however, somewhat larger than more recent and accurate estimates [3, 10]. The possible reason for this discrepancy has been discussed in detail in [3].




FIG. 5: The  $b\beta$  dependence of the correlation dimension  $D_2$  obtained from its average value. The dashed lines correspond to the analytical estimates in the limiting cases of  $b \ll 1$  and  $b \gg 1$  (12).

Finally we present the behavior of the correlation dimension as a function of the parameter  $b$ . This is presented in Fig. (5) which shows that in fact  $D_2$  is a unique function of  $b\beta$ . In this figure we plotted the slope of  $\langle D_2 \rangle \ln N$  vs  $\ln N$  for the various values of  $b$  and  $\beta$ . The analytical estimates of [9]

$$D_2 = \begin{cases} 1 - (\pi b\beta)^{-1}, & b \gg 1 \\ 2b\beta, & b \ll 1. \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

According to the figure we see that our numerical simulations are in full accordance with the analytical estimates. The discrepancies here also are attributed to the considerably smaller set of samples and smaller range of matrix size  $N$  as compared to [9].

In conclusion we have performed numerical simulations of the power law band random matrices in order to obtain the PDF of the correlation dimension. We found that this function has a fixed point,  $D_2^*$ , very close to the value of  $\tilde{D}_2$  obtained from the scaling of the typical IPN,  $I_2^{typ}$ . Besides a direct relation between the average correlation dimension,  $\langle D_2 \rangle$ , enabled us to obtain a third estimate of the correlation dimension. All of these are

in good agreement with each other that corroborates the expectation, that there is a unique value of the correlation dimension characterizing the states at the Anderson transition. For finite size simulations, the state-to-state fluctuations of both the IPN and the correlation dimension are large, nevertheless, both the PDF of  $I_2$  and that of  $D_2$  provide a unique value of  $\tilde{D}_2$  in the limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . This way we have reconciled the apparent contradiction between the state-to-state fluctuation of the correlation dimension and the universal scaling of the IPN. Similar results may be achieved for other generalized dimensions, e.g. the information dimension,  $D_1$  [13].

The author thanks financial support from the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation and from the OTKA Nos. T032116 and T034832.

- 
- [1] M. Janssen, Phys. Rep. **295**, 1 (1998); Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **8**, 943 (1994).
  - [2] A.D. Mirlin, Phys. Rep. **326**, 259 (2000); B. Kramer and A. MacKinnon, Rep. Prog. Phys. **56**, 1469 (1993).
  - [3] A. Mildenberger, F. Evers, A.D. Mirlin, preprint `cond-mat/0111081`.
  - [4] Y.V. Fyodorov and A.D. Mirlin, Phys. Rev. B **55**, R16001 (1997).
  - [5] V.E. Kravtsov and K.A. Muttalib, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 1913 (1997); J.T. Chalker, V.E. Kravtsov, and I.V. Lerner, Pis'ma Zh. Éksp. Teor. Fiz. **64**, 355 (1996) [JETP Lett. **64**, 386 (1996)].
  - [6] V.E. Kravtsov, Ann. Phys. (Leipzig) **8**, 621 (1999); V.E. Kravtsov and A.M. Tsvelik, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 9888 (2000).
  - [7] B. Huckestein and R. Klesse, Phys. Rev. B **59**, 9714 (1999) and references therein.
  - [8] D.A. Parshin and H.R. Schober, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 4590 (1999).
  - [9] F. Evers and A.D. Mirlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 3690 (2000); A.D. Mirlin and F. Evers, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 7920 (2000).
  - [10] E. Cuevas, M. Ortuño, V. Gasparian, and A. Pérez-Garrido, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 016401 (2002).
  - [11] E. Cuevas, preprint `cond-mat/0204197`.
  - [12] I. Varga and D. Braun, Phys. Rev. B **61**, R11859 (2000).
  - [13] I. Varga, unpublished.