## M on itoring the localization-delocalization transition within a 1D m odel with non-random long-range interaction

A.V.Malyshev

Departamento de F sica Aplicada, Universidad de Salamanca, E-37071 Salamanca, Spain

V.A.Malyshev

Institute for Theoretical Physics and Materials Science Center, University of Groningen, Nijenborgh 4, 9747 AG Groningen, The Netherlands<sup>y</sup>

F.Dom nguez-Adame

G ISC, Departamento de F sica de Materiales, Universidad Complutense, E-28040 Madrid, Spain (Dated: March 22, 2024)

We consider a two-parameter one-dimensional Ham iltonian with uncorrelated diagonal disorder and non-random long-range inter-site interaction  $J_{m\,n} = J=jn$  nj. The model is critical at 1 < < 3=2 and reveals the localization-delocalization transition with respect to the disorder magnitude. To detect the transition we analyze level and wave function statistics. It is demonstrated also that in the marginal case ( = 3=2) all states are localized.

PACS num bers: 71.30.+ h; 72.15.Rn; 78.30 Ly; 36.20 Kd

Localization-delocalization transition (LDT) in disordered systems, predicted by Anderson for three dim ensions (3D) in 1958,<sup>1</sup> (see also R ef. 2) still rem ains a fascinating problem (see Refs. 3,4,5 for an overview). During the last two decades, a rem arkable progress has been achieved in understanding the LDT, especially in discovering the nature of the wave function at transition. This progress became possible thanks to the fruitful idea of the multifractality of wave functions at criticality.<sup>6,7,8,9,10</sup> This conjecture was then analytically proven for an ensem ble of power-law random banded matrices (PRMB), which revealed the LDT with respect to the interaction exponent<sup>11,12</sup> (see Ref. 5 for an overview). Within the fram ework of the latter, it was demonstrated, in particular, that (i) the distribution function of the inverse participation ratio (IPR) is scale invariant at transition and (ii) the relative IPR uctuation (the ratio standarddeviation/m ean) is of the order of unity at the critical point.<sup>13,14</sup> This nding con med the conjecture, that was put forward for the rst time in Refs. 15,16, that distributions of relevant physical magnitudes are universalat criticality (see also R efs. 17,18,19). This invariance is then a powerful tool to monitor the critical point.

In the present paper, we consider a two-parameter tight-binding Ham iltonian on a regular 1D lattice of size N with non-random long-range inter-site interaction:

$$H = {\begin{array}{*{20}c} X^{N} & X^{N} \\ m_{n} j_{n} j_{n} j_{m} j_{m} j_{m} \\ n = 1 \\ m_{n} j_{n} = 1 \end{array}} J_{m_{n} j_{n}} j_{m} j_{m} j_{m} j_{m} j_{m} (1)$$

where jni is the ket vector of a state with on-site energy "n. These energies are stochastic variables, uncorrelated for di erent sites and distributed uniform ly around zero within the interval of width . The hopping integrals are  $J_{m n} = J = jn$  nj,  $J_{nn} = 0$  with 1 < 3=2. For de niteness we set J > 0, then the LDT with respect to disorder magnitude occurs at the upper band edge,

provided  $1 < 3=2.^{20,21}$  The transition is analogous to that within the standard 3D Anderson model. = 3=2 represents the marginal case in which all states are expected to be weakly localized.<sup>21</sup>

To detect the transition we analyze level and wave function statistics. We perform a numerical analysis of size and disorder scaling of the relative uctuation of both the nearest-level spacing (LS) and the participation number (PN). The latter is de ned as:

$$P = j_{n=1}^{n} j_{n}^{4} ; \qquad (2)$$

where n denotes the n th component of the th normalized eigenstate of the H am iltonian (1).

The relative uctuation of the nearest-level spacing is an invariant parameter at transition, as was conjectured in Ref. 17 for the 3D Anderson model and demonstrated later for a variety of other disordered models (see e.g. Refs. 5 and references therein). The invariance can be used to detect the critical point. We demonstrate that within the present model, the ratio of the standard deviation of the PN (SDPN) to its mean value (MPN) is also an invariant parameter at the critical disorderm agnitude c. Therefore, the ratio SDPN/MPN can also be used

to detect the transition. To the best of our know ledge, this quantity has never been used for this purpose.

As the LDT occurs at the top of the band within the considered two-param eter model, we calculate disorder and size scaling for uppermost states. Open chains are used in all calculations. We take advantage of the Lanczosm ethod to calculate the scaling for large system sizes (up to about 6  $10^4$  sites) and two particular values of the interaction exponent: = 4=3 (the LDT occurs) and = 3=2 (the marginal case; no transition is expected<sup>21</sup>).



FIG.1: D isorder scaling of the relative uctuation of the nearest-level spacing (the ratio SD LS/M LS) for = 4=3 in the vicinity of the joint intersection point (that is at = 10:7 11:5 J). The curves are calculated for di erent system sizes N and averaged over more than 5 10 (65536=N) disorder realizations.

First, we calculate the critical point by means of the level statistics analysis. In Fig. 1 we plotted the disorder scaling of the ratio of the standard deviation of the nearest-level spacing (SD LS) distribution to its mean (M LS) at the top of the band for = 4=3. The gure demonstrates that all disorder-scaling curves plotted for di erent system sizes intersect within a narrow range of , between 10:7J and 11:5J.

Calculations of the scaling of the relative PN uctuation con m the conjecture that the ratio SDPN/MPN is also a size invariant param eter at transition: Fig.2 shows that all SDPN/MPN curves plotted versus disorder for di erent system sizes intersect in a narrow range of , from 10.0J to 10.6J. One can deduce from Fig.2 that both the MPN and the SDPN are of the same order of m agnitude at the intersection for any system size, as was shown for otherm odels in Refs. 11,13,14,18,19.

The regular size dependence of intersection points in Figs.1 and 2 is a nite size e ect; accounting for the latter by means of the nite size scaling analysis allows for obtaining the value of the critical disorder. Both gures demonstrate that nite size e ects are unusually strong which, within the present model, results from the long-range nature of the inter-site interaction. Contrary to the standard Anderson model, the contribution of the long-range coupling terms to the spectrum of the H am iltonian (1) converges very slow ly as the system size increases. The latter results in a corresponding increase of the band width (mostly, the upper band edge, where the LDT takes place). For an open chain, the upper band edge E (N) size-scales as follows:

$$E(N) = E_1() \frac{C()}{N^{-1}} + O(N)$$
 (3)



FIG.2: Disorder scaling of the relative uctuation of the PN (the ratio SD PN /M PN) for = 4=3 in the vicinity of the joint intersection point (that is at = 10.0 10.6 J). The curves are calculated for di event system sizes N and averaged over m ore than 5  $10^{\circ}$  (65536=N) disorder realizations.

For = 4=3, E<sub>1</sub> (4=3) 7:20J and C (4=3) 8:45J. The increase of the band width with the system size leads to the fact that disorder of the sam emagnitude is electively weaker for larger systems. The latter elect introduces regular size dependence of the critical disorder that is obtained by numerical analyses of nite systems. The contribution of other nite size elects, <sup>22,23</sup> such as in-uence of boundary regions, are expected to be weaker for large systems because of very slow convergence of the upper band edge (/ N<sup>1</sup>). Our calculations con m this conjecture.

The intersection point, (N  $_1$ ;N $_2$ ), oftwo disorder scaling curves plotted for di erent system sizes N $_1$  and N $_2$  depends on the sizes. To account for such dependencies we proceed as follows. First, set by de nition:

$$_{c}(N) = (N 1; N + 1); N_{r}! 1; (4)$$

where  $_{\rm c}$  (N) is the critical disorder that can be obtained by analyses of a nite system of size N (N  $_{\rm r}$  is the num – ber of disorder realizations over which the averaging is perform ed). Second, use the following anzats for the intersection point:

$$(N_1; N_2) = w (N_1) _{c} (N_1) + w (N_2) _{c} (N_2);$$
 (5)

where the weight function w (N) is to be determined. Bearing in m ind the slow convergence of the band edge (/ N<sup>1</sup>), we use the following anzats for  $_{\rm c}$  (N):

$$_{c}(N)$$
  $_{c}(1) + bN^{1} + cN ; N 1; (6)$ 

where the b, c, and > 1 are thing parameters. U sing the anzats (6) together with Eqs. (5) and (6) and expanding (N 1;N + 1) in series about N (at N 1), we not the weight function: w (N) = 1=2+0 ( $1=N^{+1}$ ). Further, for any given pair N<sub>1</sub> < N<sub>2</sub> (N<sub>1</sub>;N<sub>2</sub> 1) there exists the size N , such that  $_{c}(N) = (N_{1}; N_{2})$ . M aking use of the latter equation together with Eq. (6) and keeping the leading (non-zero) power of system size in all expansions, we not the sought N :

$$N = \frac{2^{1=p} N_1 N_2}{(N_1^{p} + N_2^{p})^{1=p}}; \quad p = 1:$$
(7)

Thus, the intersection point of disorder-scaling curves plotted for two di erent system sizes  $N_1 < N_2$  ( $N_1$ ;  $N_2$  1) yields the critical disorder for an interm ediate system size N as de ned by Eq. (7).

W e further use Eq. (7) and intersection points of the curves in Fig. 1 (LS data) and Fig. 2 (PN data) to obtain  $_{c}(N)$ . Figure 3 shows  $_{c}(N)$  together with best nonlinear ts of Eq. (6) to the whole data sets (dashed lines) and the best linear tofE (N) given by Eq. (3) to the three last PN-data points (solid line). The nonlinear ts give  $_{c}(1) = (10:97)$ 0:09)J for the LS data, and  $_{c}(1) = (11:19)$ 0:10)J for the whole PN data set, while the linear t of E (N) to the tail PN points gives  $_{C}(1) = (10.91 \quad 0.17)$  J. The obtained values of  $_{\rm c}\,(\!1$  ) agree well with each other. This con  $\,\rm rm\,s$  our conjecture that for large system sizes the band edge size dependence provides the dom inant contribution to the nite size e ects. Finally, the critical disorder is determined as  $_{c}(1) = (11:09 \quad 0:21)J$  for = 4=3.



FIG. 3: Critical disorder sizes scaling obtained from the PN data () and level statistics data (N). D ashed lines are best ts of Eq. (6) to the LS data (b = 26.44, c = 824.16, = 0:70) and the PN data (b = 21.61, c = 12.73, = 2.82). The solid line is the best linear to fEq. (3) to the last three PN data points:  $_{\rm c}$  (N) = (1.52 0:02) E (N).

It should be noticed that, despite that both m ethods to detect the LDT are in good agreement, nite size e ects are m ore pronounced in the case of analysis of the level statistics. For these reasons, the proposed m ethod w hich is based on the studies of the wave function statistics appears to be advantageous, at least for the considered m odel.



FIG. 4: a) D isorder scaling of the relative PN uctuation (the ratio SDPN/MPN) for = 3=2 in the vicinity of the joint intersection point at  $_{\rm c}$  = 0. The curves are calculated for two di erent system sizes (65536 and 8192) and averaged over m ore than 5  $10^3$  and  $10^5$  disorder realizations respectively. b) A blow up of the crossing at the origin.

W e applied the same technique to analyze the localization properties in the marginal case, = 3=2, where the states are expected to be localized weakly.<sup>21</sup> F igure 4 shows the SDPN/MPN scaling curves in the vicinity of the only joint intersection point that appears to be trivial:  $_{c} = 0$ . Size scaling of the ratio MPN/N (see Fig. 5) reveals no transition too; all MPN/N size-scaling curves for non-zero magnitude of disorder decrease with system size, as they do for a localized (or critical) state. Thus, no signatures of the LDT can be observed in the marginal case, indicating that all states are localized.

In sum m ary, we studied num erically the critical properties of the 1D two-param eter tight-binding m odel with diagonal disorder and non-random long-range interaction,  $J_{m n} = J=jn$  nj, J > 0 and 1 < 3=2. The transition point was detected by m eans of the level and wave function statistics. We used the conjecture on the scale invariance of the distribution function of the nearest-level spacing and the participation number at criticality. We nd, in particular, that the critical point for = 4=3 is \_c = (11:09 0:21)J. In the marginal case



FIG.5: Size scaling of the ratio M PN /N calculated for = 3=2 and di erent disorder m agnitudes. Thin horizontal dotted line is a quide for the eye.

( = 3=2), that is analogous to the standard 2D Anderson model,<sup>21</sup> the only joint intersection point is  $_{\rm c} = 0$ , indicating that all states are localized for a nite disorder.

On leave from Io e Physiko-Technical Institute, 26 Politechnicheskaya str., 194021 Saint-Petersburg, Russia

- <sup>y</sup> On leave from \S.I. Vavilov State Optical Institute", 199034 Saint-Petersburg, Russia.
- <sup>1</sup> P.W .Anderson, Phys. Rev. 109, 1492 (1958).
- <sup>2</sup> E.Abraham s, P.W. Anderson, D.C. Licciardello, and T. V.Ram akrishnan, Phys. Rev. Lett. 42, 673 (1979).
- <sup>3</sup> P.A. Lee and T.V. Ramakrishnan, Rev. M od. Phys. 57, 287 (1985).
- <sup>4</sup> B.K ram er and A.M acK innon, Rep. Prog. Phys. 56, 1469 (1993).
- <sup>5</sup> A.D.M irlin, Phys. Rep. 326, 259 (2000).
- <sup>6</sup> F.W egner, Z.Phys.B 36,209 (1980); Nucl.Phys.B 316, 663 (1989).
- <sup>7</sup> H.Aoki, J.Phys. C 16, L205 (1983); Phys. Rev. B 33, 7310 (1986).
- <sup>8</sup> C.Castellaniand L.Peliti, J.Phys.A 19, L429 (1986).
- <sup>9</sup> M. Schreiber and H. Grussbach, Phys. Rev. Lett. 67, 607 (1991); M od. Phys. Lett. B 6, 851 (1992).
- <sup>10</sup> M .Janssen, Int.J.M od.Phys.B 8, 943 (1994).
- <sup>11</sup> A.D.Mirlin, Y.V.Fyodorov, F.M.Dittes, J.Quezada, and T.H.Seligman, Phys. Rev. E 54, 3221 (1996).
- <sup>12</sup> L.S. Levitov, Europhys. Lett. 9, 83 (1989); Ann. Phys. (Leipzig) 8, 507 (1999).

We demonstrated that nite size e ects are very pronounced within the considered model. Level statistics appears to be more a ected by these e ects as compared to the participation number statistics. The dominant contribution to nite size e ects is determined by the size dependence of the band width. To obtain the critial disorder, we use a reform ulated nite size scaling procedure that is corrected for irrelevant size dependencies.

To conclude, we stress that the scale-invariance of the relative uctuation of the participation number at transition is a consequence of critical wave function uctuations. We conjecture, therefore, that the analysis of the relative uctuation of the participation number provides a general tool to monitor the LD T. The proposed method proves to work well for the standard 3D Anderson model too.<sup>24</sup> We believe also that this property holds at the mobility edge, allowing therefore to monitor the latter.

## A cknow ledgm ents

The authors thank A. Rodr guez, M. A. Mart n-Delgado and G. Sierra for discussions. This work was supported by DGI-MCyT (MAT2003-01533) and MECyD (SB2001-0146).

- <sup>13</sup> F. Evers and A. D. M irlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 3690 (2000).
- $^{14}$  A.D.M irlin and F.Evers, Phys.Rev.B 62, 7920 (2000).
- <sup>15</sup> B. Shapiro, Phys. Rev. B 34, 4394 (1986); Phil. M ag. B 56, 1031 (1987).
- <sup>16</sup> A.Cohen, Y.Roth, and B.Shapiro, Phys. Rev. B 38, 12125 (1988).
- <sup>17</sup> B. I. Shklovskii, B. Shapiro, B. R. Sears, P. Lambrianides, and H. B. Shore, Phys. Rev. B 47, 11487 (1993).
- <sup>18</sup> Y.V.Fyodorov and A.D.M irlin, Phys.Rev.B 51, 13403 (1995).
- <sup>19</sup> V.N.Prigodin and B.L.Altshuler, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 1944 (1998).
- <sup>20</sup> A.Rodr guez, V.A.M alyshev, and F.Dom nguez-A dam e, J.Phys.A:M ath.Gen.33, L161 (2000).
- <sup>21</sup> A.Rodr guez, V.A.M alyshev, G.Sierra, M.A.M art n-Delgado, J.Rodr guez-Laguna, and F.Dom nguez-A dam e, Phys.Rev.Lett. 90, 27404 (2003).
- <sup>22</sup> A.M acK innon, J.P hys.: C ond.M at. 6 2511 (1994)
- $^{23}$  K.Slevin and T.Ohtsuki, Phys.Rev.Lett. 82 382 (1999)
- <sup>24</sup> G.Schubert, A.W eisse, and H.Fehske, cond-mat/0309015 and private communication.