

Coherence and Coulomb blockade in single electron devices: a unified treatment of interaction effects

S. Florens,¹ P. San Jose,² F. Guinea,² and A. Georges¹

¹Laboratoire de Physique Theorique, Ecole Normale Supérieure,
24 Rue Lhomond 75231 Paris Cedex 05, France

²Instituto de Ciencia de Materiales de Madrid, CSIC, Cantoblanco, E-28049 Madrid, Spain

We study the interplay between Coulomb blockade and the Kondo effect in quantum dots. We use a self-consistent scheme which describes mesoscopic devices in terms of a collective phase variable (slave rotor) and quasiparticle degrees of freedom. In the strong Coulomb blockade regime, we recover the description of metallic islands in terms of a phase only action. For a dot with well-separated levels, our method leads to the Kondo effect. We identify the regime where a crossover between the Coulomb blockade regime at high temperatures and the formation of a Kondo resonance at lower temperature takes place. In addition, we find that for a dot with many overlapping resonances, an inverse crossover can take place. A Kondo resonance which involves many levels within the dot is first formed, and this coherent state is suppressed by correlation effects at lower temperatures. A narrower Kondo resonance, due to a single level in the dot can emerge at even lower temperatures.

I. INTRODUCTION

Electron-electron interactions play a crucial role in single electron devices (quantum dots, metallic islands), see for instance [1, 2, 3, 4]. The electrostatic repulsion between electrons in the dot can be described by the energy required to change the charge in the dot by one unit, E_c . At temperatures, or frequencies, below this charging energy, but much greater than the spacing between the electronic levels in the dot, E , Coulomb blockade effects dominate [5, 6, 7, 8], and the conductance through the dot is suppressed, except at degeneracy points. At scales below the level splitting within the dot, and when the ground state of the dot is degenerate, electronic coherence can be restored by the Kondo effect [9, 10], leading to an increase in the conductance [11, 12, 13, 14, 15]. Hence, when the charging energy is much greater than the level spacing within the dot, $E_c \gg E$, and the number of electrons in the dot is odd, one expects a crossover between a high temperature regime where Coulomb blockade effects dominate, and a low temperature one described by the Kondo effect [16].

The theoretical analysis of these two regimes, Coulomb blockade and the Kondo effect, has been carried out using rather different techniques. Coulomb blockade can be studied, when the coupling between the leads and the dot is weak, by describing electron transport in terms of sequential hopping processes [2], i.e. perturbatively in the tunneling matrix element. When the conductance is large, it is convenient to describe the internal degrees of freedom of the dot in terms of a collective variable, the phase conjugated to the total charge [17, 18, 19]. Using this representation, the renormalization of the effective charging energy by virtual fluctuations can be studied by a variety of methods [20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26]. This approach becomes exact when the level spacing within the dot tends to zero and the number of transmitting

channels is large, which applies in fact to the physical situation of metallic islands. In this limit the Kondo effect disappears. In the opposite limit, when the level spacing within the dot becomes comparable to other scales of interest, the standard procedure is to truncate the Hilbert space of the dot, and keep only the interacting electronic states closest to the Fermi level of the leads, so that the system is reduced to the Anderson model [12, 27], see [11, 28, 29]. The situation when many levels within a magnetic impurity contribute to the Kondo effect was initially discussed in [30]. The same effect in quantum dots was analyzed in [31]. Other modifications of the Kondo effect in a quantum dot due to the presence of many levels are discussed in [32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38]. Recent experiments [39] suggest that the regime where level spacing, level broadening and the charging energy are comparable can be achieved by present day techniques.

The aim of this paper is to analyze the different regimes of a quantum dot characterized by the charging energy, E_c , level spacing, E , and coupling to the leads, Γ , where Γ is the typical width of each level. We introduce a new scheme which describes the charge excitations of the dot in terms of a collective phase, but also retains information about the electronic degrees of freedom on the dot. This approach allows to recover the Kondo effect in the case of quantum impurities with exactly degenerate levels (slave rotor representation introduced in [40] by two of us). Technically, the new scheme draws inspiration from self-consistent resummations used for describing the Kondo effect in single impurity models (the so-called Non Crossing Approximation, or NCA [41, 42]), but adapted in an economical way to the situation of mesoscopic structures (that can contain up to thousands of electrons).

The outline of this paper is as follows. In section II we review basic properties of the single electron box, and present the model that we will study throughout. The self-consistent approach used to analyze the model is presented in section III, and will be shown to describe the

Coulomb blockade regime of metallic grains exactly (also for quantum dots); we will furthermore show that it is a reasonable approximation for dealing with the Kondo effect (in quantum dots). In section IV we will investigate in more detail intermediate regimes of conduction that were not previously attainable or considered in earlier works. In particular we will be interested in the different manner in which one goes from coherent, Kondo assisted transport to the Coulomb blockade regime. Extensions of our approach to other systems such as quantum dot arrays will be briefly outlined in the conclusion.

II. MODEL FOR SINGLE ELECTRON DEVICES

A. Phase representation and electronic degrees of freedom

Let us first review the standard model for single electron devices. The basic ingredient that determines the

behavior of quantum dots as well as metallic islands is the relatively large Coulomb energy $E_c = e^2/(2C) \sim 1\text{K}$ associated with small capacitances of the structure, $C \sim 10^{-15}\text{F}$. We will take also into account the internal structure of the small charge droplet, with energy levels ϵ_p (which are shape- and disorder-dependent), and an index $p = 1::N$ associated to transmitting channels to the outside circuit. The electrodes, to which the mesoscopic region is coupled, are described as Fermi liquids with a spectrum ϵ_k associated with a finite density of states $D(0)$ at the Fermi level. Physical quantities, such as the conductance G , are also determined as a function of temperature T (we set $\hbar = T$) and applied gate voltage V_g . Summarizing all these energy scales, we arrive at the following hamiltonian:

$$H = \sum_k \epsilon_k a_k^\dagger a_k + \sum_p \epsilon_p d_p^\dagger d_p + E_c \sum_p d_p^\dagger d_p + \sum_{k,p} t_{kp}^\dagger a_k^\dagger d_p + d_p^\dagger a_k \quad (1)$$

We have introduced here the coupling t_{kp}^\dagger between the mode p in the electrode and mode k in the electron box. The index $p = 1::N_L$ corresponds to the N_L energy levels of the dot (or metallic island), and $k = 1::N$ is the conserved channel index (including spin). We defined also n_g as a dimensionless external gate voltage, $n_g = eV_g/(2E_c)$. Because of the large number of degrees of freedom involved with respect to a single impurity Anderson model (N_L or N can be quite large), this hamiltonian is remarkably complicated.

One way to make progress is to single out the relevant charge variable on the dot, and pilot its dynamics by means of a rotor degree of freedom:

$$\sum_p d_p^\dagger d_p = \hat{B} = i\partial/\partial\theta \quad (2)$$

This mapping is motivated by the fact that the hamiltonian $H_{\text{rotor}} = E_c \hat{B}^2$, with its quadratic spectrum, re-

produces exactly the charging energy term in (1). Alternatively, one can argue, as in [17, 18], that a metallic grain can be studied with the same formalism used for a superconducting grain, except that the gap vanishes. In this case, the phase is the collective variable conjugate to the number of particles, as implied by equation (2).

In order to fulfill the Pauli principle, one must however keep fermionic degrees of freedom, so that the creation of a physical electron on the dot is represented as:

$$d_p^\dagger = f_p^\dagger e^{i\theta} \quad (3)$$

using a channel- and momentum-carrying quasiparticle f_p^\dagger . According to (2), a constraint $\hat{B} = \sum_p f_p^\dagger f_p$ must also be implemented [40], introducing for this purpose a Lagrange multiplier λ . Integrating explicitly the electrode in (1), one gets the following expression for the action of the original model in this new representation:

$$S = \sum_0^Z \sum_p \int_0^{\beta} f_p^\dagger (\partial_\tau + \epsilon_p) f_p + \frac{(\partial_\tau + i\lambda)^2}{4E_c} + i n_g \theta + \sum_0^Z \sum_0^Z \frac{1}{N_L} \sum_{pp^0} f_{p^0}^\dagger (\partial_\tau + \epsilon_{p^0}) f_p (\partial_\tau + \epsilon_p) e^{i(\theta_p - \theta_{p^0})} \quad (4)$$

In principle, θ should be integrated over $[0; 2\pi]$ in order to preserve the correct structure of the Hilbert space.

One can notice in this expression how the indices are po-

sitioned in the last term (is conserved by the charge transfer procedure, whereas p is not). We also have defined the bath function:

$$\rho_{pp^0}(i!) = \sum_k \frac{N_L t_k^p t_k^{p^0}}{i!} = \sum_k D''(i!) \frac{N_L t_k^p t_k^{p^0}}{i!} \quad (5)$$

introducing the lead density of states $D''(i!) = \sum_k (i!)^{-1}$ (we have extracted here a factor $1/N_L$ for future convenience).

$$S[\phi] = \sum_0 \int d\tau \frac{(\phi + i)^2}{4E_c} + \ln_g \phi + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n}{n!} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_0 \int d\tau \sum_0 \frac{1}{N_L} \sum_{p_m, p_m^0}^{\infty} \rho_{p_m, p_m^0}(\tau) e^{i(\tau) \cdot i(\tau)} f_{p_m}^Y(\tau) f_{p_m^0}^0(\tau) \quad (6)$$

The average over the fermionic variables ϕ in the preceding expression is taken with respect to the free fermionic action $S_0 = \sum_0 \int d\tau \sum_p f_p^Y(\phi + \phi_p) f_p$, and simplifies considerably in the large N_L limit because Wick contractions at leading order occur between pairs of fermions holding the same channel index m . We can

$$S[\phi] = \sum_0 \int d\tau \frac{(\phi)^2}{4E_c} + \ln_g \phi + \sum_0 \int d\tau \sum_0 \rho_0(\tau) e^{i(\tau) \cdot i(\tau)} \quad (7)$$

The kernel $\rho_0(\tau)$ in the last equation is given by the expression:

$$\rho_0(\tau) = \frac{1}{N_L} \sum_{p, p^0} \rho_{pp^0}(\tau) f_p^Y(\tau) f_{p^0}^0(\tau) \quad (8)$$

which can be evaluated:

$$\rho_0(\tau) = \frac{(\tau)^2}{[\sin(\tau)]^2} \quad (9)$$

$$\text{with } \tau = N N_L t^2 D(0) \phi(0) \quad (10)$$

Here $\phi(0) = \sum_p (\phi_p)$ is the grain density of states, which is supposed to be continuous for metallic islands, and we have taken the large bandwidth limit to obtain equation (9). We have also assumed for simplicity that the coupling to the lead is a constant, $t_k^p = t$ (point contact), and that it is sufficiently small so that τ is at most of order one when both N_L and N are large. The parameter τ is interpreted as the (dimensionless) high temperature conductance between the dot and the island, to lowest order in the hopping t [17, 18, 22].

B. Metallic grains: phase only approach

In the case of small metallic islands [6, 7], the number of transverse channels $N \sim 10^4 - 10^6$ is quite large, so that the fermionic degrees of freedom can be integrated out explicitly from (4). Technically, this is done by expanding the initial action (4) in the coupling function $\rho_{pp^0}(\tau)$, leading to an exact expression of the effective action:

$$\rho_{p_m, p_m^0}(\tau) = \sum_m \sum_{m^0} e^{i(\tau) \cdot i(\tau)} f_{p_m}^Y(\tau) f_{p_m^0}^0(\tau) \quad (6)$$

then re-exponentiate the last term in (6), and, if one notes that the multiplier can be treated in the grand canonical ensemble, i.e. reabsorbed in \ln_g (due to small charge fluctuations over many accessible states), one gets the effective phase-only action:

$$S[\phi] = \sum_0 \int d\tau \frac{(\phi)^2}{4E_c} + \ln_g \phi + \sum_0 \int d\tau \sum_0 \rho_0(\tau) e^{i(\tau) \cdot i(\tau)} \quad (7)$$

Physically, the use of the phase-only action [22] is vindicated by the fact that the charge fluctuations are suppressed by the Coulomb blockade phenomenon, allowing one to forget about the fermionic statistics of the charge carriers (incoherent transport through the island).

This phase-only action (7) can be handled using a variety of techniques [20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26]. An important question, which is very relevant for experiments on small metallic grains strongly coupled to the environment [8, 43], is the destruction of Coulomb blockade in the strong tunneling regime $\tau \gg 0.1$. This implies a generic renormalization of the Coulomb energy E_c towards smaller values, denoted here by E_c [21, 23]. In the following, we will be more interested in this question in the context of quantum dots, for which the model (7) is inadequate. However, the phase-only approach will be considered as an important benchmark for any approach that intends to describe the Coulomb blockade regime.

III. UNIFIED APPROACH TO SINGLE ELECTRON DEVICES

A. Self-consistent scheme

Our purpose here is to develop a simple approximation scheme (avoiding direct numerical solution of the model (1)) that could encompass the main interaction effects in single electron devices: the Coulomb blockade and the Kondo effect. One can note that one is usually forced to employ different techniques to handle the Coulomb interaction, depending on the regime one is interested in. Since the details of the dynamics of the electrons are not usually involved in the Coulomb blockade phenomenon, introducing the total charge as the physi-

cally relevant variable and using the phase-only action (7) seem mandatory to deal with this regime. On the other hand, dealing with the Kondo effect requires a rather sophisticated treatment of the correlation effects among electrons, and a simplification of the initial model (1) is unavoidable. We will see in this paper that one can reconcile these two paradigms if one treats on an equal footing fermionic degrees of freedom and the phase variable conjugated to the total charge.

Drawing inspiration from strong coupling approaches for single impurity models (NCA [41] and its generalization to the phase representation (2) as introduced by two of us [40]), we will perform a self-consistent decoupling of the fermion-rotor coupling in (4):

$$S' = \sum_0^Z \sum_p^X f_p^y (\partial + p) f_p + \sum_0^Z \sum_0^Z \frac{1}{N_L} \sum_{pp^0}^X \text{pp}^0 () e^{i () i ()} f_p^y () f_{p^0} () \quad (11)$$

$$+ \sum_0^Z \frac{(\partial + i)^2}{4E_c} + i n_g \partial + \sum_0^Z \sum_0^Z \frac{1}{N_L} \sum_{pp^0}^X \text{pp}^0 () f_p^y () f_{p^0} () e^{i () i ()} \quad (12)$$

This approximation goes far beyond the lowest order perturbative result that led to the phase-only action (7), and is the central starting point of the present work. Its distinctive feature is the decoupling of fermionic and phase degrees of freedom, whose joint dynamics is nevertheless determined self-consistently. Indeed, the fermionic self-energy obviously depends on the phase-phase correlator, and reciprocally. Moreover, the bosonic part of the effective action (12) is similar in structure to the phase-only approach (7), allowing to use the large body of work on this particular model.

In order to detail the method of solution, we start here by simplifying the kernels appearing in the previous self-consistent action. The bosonic kernel can be expressed in terms of the full propagator $G_f^{pp^0}$ of the f_p^y fermions:

$$\begin{aligned} () &= \frac{1}{N_L} \sum_{pp^0}^X \text{pp}^0 () f_p^y () f_{p^0} () \\ &= \frac{1}{N_L} \sum_{pp^0}^X \text{pp}^0 () G_f^{pp^0} () \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where the Green's function Φ_f has been introduced in a matrix notation:

$$\Phi_f = \Phi_0^{-1} \frac{1}{N_L} b_f^{-1} = \Phi_0^{-1} \frac{1}{N_L} b_f \Phi_0^{-1} \quad (14)$$

with the free propagator in the electron box:

$$G_0^{pp^0}(i!) = \frac{\text{pp}^0}{i! p +} \quad (15)$$

We also have introduced the self-energy of the quasiparticles:

$$\text{pp}_f^0 () = \text{pp}^0 () e^{i () i ()} \quad (16)$$

The "self-consistent phase action" that one needs to solve finally reads:

$$S = \sum_0^Z \frac{(\partial + i)^2}{4E_c} + i n_g \partial + \sum_0^Z \sum_0^Z \frac{1}{N_L} \sum_{pp^0}^X \text{pp}^0 () e^{i () i ()} \quad (17)$$

with () given previously. The set of equations (13-17)

is the main technical result of this paper. In practice,

this is solved by an iterative procedure which starts with a given kernel $\chi^{(0)}$ as input to the action (17), from which a new correlator $\chi^{(1)}$ is computed. It is then fed back to the self-energy (16), allowing to compute the quasiparticle propagator (14), and then a new kernel $\chi^{(2)}$ from equation (13). This full cycle is repeated until convergence is reached.

In all further calculations, we will assume a point contact between lead and box, $t_k^p = t$, so that $\chi^{pp^0}(\omega) = \chi(\omega)$ and $\chi_f^{pp^0}(\omega) = \chi_f(\omega) = \chi(\omega) e^{i(\omega - \epsilon_0)}$, which allows to simplify expressions (13) and (14) into:

$$\chi(\omega) = N \chi_f^{loc}(\omega) \quad (18)$$

$$G_f^{loc}(i!) = \frac{1}{N_L} \sum_{pp^0} G_f^{pp^0}(i!) \quad (19)$$

$$G_f^{loc}(i!) = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{N_L} \sum_{pp^0} \frac{1}{i! + p + 1}} \chi_f(i!) \quad (20)$$

In the following two paragraphs, we will sketch how this novel scheme allows to capture both Coulomb blockade and Kondo effect in single electron devices.

B. Metallic islands: Coulomb blockade

We consider here the case of a metallic island, for which the energy spectrum is taken as a continuous density of states $\rho_0(\omega)$. Due to the smallness of the Fermi wavelength with respect to the typical transverse size of the island, the number of transmitting channels is usually quite large, $N \gg 1$, as discussed before in section II B.

One interesting remark is that our self-consistent phase model (11-12) exactly reproduces the phase-only approach (7) in this case. Indeed, we note that the fermionic self-energy (16) is suppressed with respect to the kernel (18) by a relative factor of order $1/N$. The self-consistency between fermions and the phase variable can therefore be ignored at $N \gg 1$ (one has to scale $t \rightarrow t/N$), leading to a free fermionic propagator:

$$G_0^{pp^0}(\omega) = f_p^y(0) f_{p^0}(\omega) \rho_0 \quad (21)$$

$$G_0^{pp^0}(i!) = \frac{f_p^y f_{p^0}}{i! + p} \quad (22)$$

Putting this expression back into (13), one recovers indeed the phase-only action (7-8). This test case implies that our self-consistent scheme allows to deal correctly with the Coulomb blockade phenomenon in metallic grains.

C. Quantum dots: interaction effects

In quantum dots, the discreteness of the energy spectrum ϵ_p and the fact that N is generally of order one

(unless the point contacts are quite open) invalidate the phase-only approach (7). This is clear from the fact that coherent transport through the dot can be restored due to the Kondo effect at low temperature. We now sketch how the self-consistent action (17) is able to describe this phenomenon.

1. Coulomb blockade regime in quantum dots

We consider first temperatures smaller than the charging energy E_c , but still greater than the interlevel spacing E . We can therefore take a continuous limit for the dot (due to thermal smearing of the energy levels), which leads crudely to the simplification:

$$\frac{1}{N_L} \sum_p \frac{1}{(i! + p + 1)} \approx \frac{1}{i! + 1/2} \quad (23)$$

From (20), this gives the f_p^y fermion propagator in the dot:

$$G_f^{loc}(i!) \approx \frac{1}{i! + 1/2} \chi_f(i!) \quad (24)$$

The constant imaginary part in the last expression dominates the long time behavior of the Green's function $G_f^{loc}(\omega)$, so that the kernel (18) decays as $1/\omega^2$, similarly to the case of the metallic island (9). There is therefore Coulomb blockade in this regime, as expected.

2. Kondo effect in quantum dots: first discussion

At temperatures below the interlevel spacing E in the dot, the discreteness of the spectrum becomes sizeable. Let us assume here that a single level sits close to the Fermi energy, so that we can forget all other levels. In this case, we can argue here that the factorization (11-12) reproduces the Kondo physics correctly. This property is well known if, instead of the phase variable ϕ , one uses a slave boson representation of the interaction (in the case of the $E_c = 1$ limit) [44]. This method has been extended recently by two of us to the case of finite E_c , using the phase representation $d_p^y = f_p^y e^{i\phi}$ [40], and shown to lead to a good approximation scheme for dealing with the Kondo effect.

In quantum dots, the Kondo effect manifests itself by the buildup of a many-body resonance close to the Fermi level that allows the coherent transport of charge through the structure. The existence of the Friedel sum rule (to be discussed later on) guarantees that the conductance through the dot can recover the unitarity limit (i.e. $G = 2e^2/h$) at low temperature.

In conclusion, we can therefore expect that our self-consistent approach interpolates between the coherent Kondo regime (associated with a large and increasing conductance with decreasing temperature) and the

Coulomb blockade (which leads to a suppression of the charge fluctuations on the dot and a decreasing conductance). In practice, we still need to solve the self-consistent phase problem (11-12). This will be done in the next section.

IV. INTERMEDIATE CONDUCTION REGIMES IN QUANTUM DOTS

A. Solution of the phase action in the spherical limit

The simplest, yet non trivial treatment of the bosonic action (17) is to take its spherical limit [40, 45, 46] (this is also equivalent to the large number of component limit for the sigma model in the field theory literature [47]). We introduce for this purpose the complex phase field $X(\omega) = e^{i\phi(\omega)}$, with its correlator $G_X(\omega) = \langle X(\omega) X(0) \rangle$. This representation is perfectly equivalent to the original problem if the hard constraint $X(\omega)^2 = 1$ is maintained exactly. The approximation that we will make in order to solve the (self-consistent) phase action (17) is to impose this constraint on average only. For this we introduce a Lagrange multiplier to enforce the equality $G_X(\omega = 0) = \langle X(\omega)^2 \rangle = 1$. The main drawback (on a qualitative level) of this approximation is that, although it works well close to the center of the charge plateaus, it eventually breaks down at the degeneracy points [40]. We will also enforce the constraint $\sum_p f_p^x f_p^y = 0$ on average. In the symmetric case (i.e. at the center of a plateau), this simply implies that $\mu = 0$.

The bosonic action is now purely quadratic, leading to the set of self-consistent equations [57]:

$$G_X(i\omega_n) = \frac{2}{2E_c} + \frac{1}{i\omega_n} \quad (25)$$

$$G_X(\omega = 0) = \frac{1}{N_L} \quad (26)$$

$$G_f^{loc}(i\omega_n) = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{N_L} \sum_p 1 - (i\omega_n - \mu)} \quad (27)$$

$$\langle \phi \rangle = N_L \langle \phi \rangle G_f^{loc}(\omega) \quad (28)$$

$$f(\omega) = \langle \phi \rangle G_X(\omega) \quad (29)$$

with the notation:

$$(i\omega_n) = \sum_k \frac{X_k}{i\omega_n - \mu_k} \quad (30)$$

We have noted here ω_n (resp. ω_n) a fermionic (resp. bosonic) Matsubara frequency. In addition to the relative simplicity of this scheme, we note that it allows to obtain a solution for real frequency quantities (doing the analytic continuation of these equations), as required for computing spectral and transport properties of quantum dots.

A few technical remarks: The system of equations (25-30) was derived previously for the single-level Anderson model [40] using a slightly different route (namely a large-M multichannel point of view more suitable to understand some non Fermi liquid aspects of the solution). We feel that a two-step procedure that starts with equations (11-12) is more appealing in the present context, as the self-consistent phase action (12) can be tackled in principle with variety of methods. We have therefore taken the point of view of simplicity in doing the spherical limit described in the previous paragraph.

The numerical solution of the coupled integral equations is straightforward using Fast Fourier Transforms (we will also give analytical arguments later on). In all calculations that follow, we take $N = 2$ (single channel of conduction per spin). The Coulomb energy is chosen as the reference, $E_c = 1$, and the bandwidth of the continuous density of states of the electrodes is $\Gamma = 50$, which is the largest energy scale of the problem. The precise form of the spectrum in the electrodes playing little role in the low energy limit, we have chosen a semi-elliptic density of states:

$$\rho(\omega) = N_L \sqrt{\frac{8}{\pi}} \sqrt{1 - \omega^2} \quad (31)$$

The single-level width $\Gamma \text{Im}(i0^+) \approx N_L = 4t^2$ (see equation (4)) characterizes the strength of the coupling of the electrons in the dot to the reservoirs. Other important parameters, that we will also investigate, are the separation between the electronic levels of the dot, E , and the number of states in the dot, N_L . We also define a typical "bandwidth" of the dot, $W = E(N_L - 1)$ (although the spectrum is made up of discrete states).

A technical aspect worth mentioning is the method of computation of the conductance through the dot. In the same spirit of the decoupling performed in equations (11-12), we will compute the Green's function of the physical electron as $G_d^{loc}(\omega) = G_f^{loc}(\omega) G_X(\omega)$. An analytical continuation (performed numerically) allows then to get the (interacting) density of states in the dot, $\rho_d(\omega) = \text{Im}(G_d^{loc}(\omega + i0^+))$. We will also use the interacting Landauer formula for the conductance [28]:

$$G = \frac{N e^2}{h} N_L \sum_d \frac{\partial n_F(\omega_d)}{\partial \omega_d} \rho_d(\omega_d) \quad (32)$$

where $n_F(\omega) = 1/(e^{\beta\omega} + 1)$ is the Fermi function. This expression involves the "local" density of states (i.e. summed over all $p = 1 \dots N_L$) because of the form of the local coupling to the reservoir, see equation (1).

In the following, we explore situations that are intermediate to the single level Kondo effect and the Coulomb blockade regime, depending on the internal structure of the quantum dot. We insist on the fact that the results that we will obtain are not easily accessible to usual approaches of the hamiltonian (1), unless only a few levels in the dot are considered (for which case the Numerical Renormalization Group is quite successful [37, 48]).

B. Results for finite interlevel spacing: Kondo effect and Coulomb blockade

We now analyze the case of a few, well-separated energy levels in the dot. We start by discussing the Coulomb blockade using the spherical limit (for temperature larger than the interlevel spacing), then we give analytical arguments in favor of the existence of a Kondo resonance at lower temperature, and finally we show the full numerical solution of the self-consistent equations corresponding to the usual situation found in experiments.

1. Renormalized Coulomb energy

As discussed in section IIIC 1, for $T \ll E_c$ the quantum dot is in the Coulomb blockade regime, and the bosonic kernel (28) behaves at long times as $\chi(t) \sim t^{-2}$, see eq.(9). Here t is a measure of the dimensionless high temperature conductance. One can now focus on equation (26), that we write (at low temperature) as:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \frac{1}{2 - (2E_c) + t_j j + (i0)} = 1 \quad (33)$$

The renormalized Coulomb energy E_c is obtained as the mass term in the phase propagator (25), which decays exponentially over time scales of order \hbar/E_c . Solving the previous equation, one gets:

$$E_c = \frac{(i0)}{t} = 2 - t E_c e^{-2t} \quad (34)$$

which is exponentially small in the bare conductance t . This quick calculation allows us to understand the origin of the Coulomb blockade for quantum dots in our formalism.

2. Single level Kondo effect: analytical proof

In quantum dots, the basic manifestations of the Kondo effect are twofold: existence of a small energy scale, the Kondo temperature T_K , and restoration of the unitarity limit (at $T < T_K$), as discussed in section IIIC 2.

To prove the first point from our integral equations (25-30), we examine qualitatively the solution of the self-consistent equations at temperatures smaller than the interlevel spacing E . There, the fermionic Green's function (27) is dominated by the $p = 0$ pole, so that $G_f^{loc}(\omega) \sim 1/(2N_L \text{Sign}(\omega))$, at long times. From equation (28), this produces in turn a rotor self-energy $\Sigma(\omega) \sim (2N_L)^{-1} \log |\omega| = T_0 \log |\omega|$ at low frequency (here T_0 is an undetermined cutoff, in practice of order E_c). Upon lowering the temperature, this self-energy can reach the charging energy E_c (assumed to be only weakly renormalized), indicating the suppression of Coulomb blockade and the beginning of the Kondo regime. This

happens (very roughly) for $(2N_L)^{-1} \log(T_K/T_0) \sim E_c$, giving the estimate:

$$T_K(N_L) = T_0 \exp \frac{E_c}{2N_L} = T_0 \exp \frac{U}{8} \quad (35)$$

This is the well-known value of T_K in the local moment regime (at half-filling), if one uses the standard notation $E_c = U/2$ with $N_L = 2$ (single-channel). It clearly explains that one key step to the experimental observation of the Kondo effect in quantum dots [13] lies in the realization of strongly coupled structures, having comparable to E_c in magnitude, such that the Kondo temperature remains accessible.

We finish by explaining precisely the restoration of full coherence below the Kondo temperature. In order to do this, we set the temperature to zero and perform an exact low-energy solution of the system of equations (25-30) (this was done in Appendix C of [40]). This analysis, valid while $E \neq 0$ for an arbitrary number of levels, leads to the following value of the zero temperature, zero frequency density of states in our approximation:

$$\rho_d(\omega = T = 0) = \frac{1}{N_L} \frac{=2}{N_L + 1} \tan N_L \frac{=2}{N_L + 1} \quad (36)$$

The interpretation of this relation is that, whenever the temperature is lower than T_K , the density of states is pinned at its non-interacting value, no matter how large the Coulomb energy E_c is. This reflects the presence of the Kondo resonance at low energy. The exact Friedel's sum rule however is $\rho_d^{exact}(\omega = T = 0) = 1/(N_L)$, independently of N . The difference between equation (36) and this exact result is a consequence of the decoupling approximation made above, and is related to the non Fermi Liquid features described in ref. [40]. This artefact is nevertheless quite small in practice, since (36) goes to the exact value for N large, and is only 10% off for $N = 2$. The Friedel's sum rule provides also a simple explanation for the restoration of the unitarity limit in the conductance below the Kondo temperature, since the Landauer formula (32) at zero temperature leads to:

$$G(T = 0) = \frac{N e^2}{h} N_L \rho_d(0) \quad (37)$$

3. Kondo effect: numerical solution and crossover to the Coulomb blockade regime

The numerical solution of the set of self-consistent equations (25-30) allows in principle to investigate all regimes of parameters. We will first concentrate on the gradual suppression of the Kondo effect with decreasing values of the single-level coupling Γ . In order to maintain the Coulomb blockade effect, we will keep in this section the total (multilevel) coupling fixed, $\Gamma_{multi} = 0.5$, and vary the number of levels N_L to allow changes in $\Gamma_{multi} = N_L \Gamma$. We will also fix the total bandwidth of

the dot, $W = 1$, so that the level spacing (assumed to be uniform) is also decreasing, $E = W/(N_L - 1)$. This way of proceeding allows to interpolate from the few, well-separated levels situation relevant for small quantum dots in the Kondo regime to the case of larger dots with small level spacing and many levels N_L , which shows only Coulomb blockade.

The figure 1 demonstrates indeed how the low temperature local density of states evolves from $N_L = 1$ (single level: regular Kondo effect) to $N_L = 1$ (continuum of levels: Coulomb blockade only). In particular the rapid suppression of the Kondo peak for diminishing values of Γ at increasing N_L is in accordance with our previous discussion of the Kondo temperature, equation (35).




FIG. 1: Local density of states $\rho_d(\omega)$ at $E_c = 1$, $\Gamma = 800$, and fixed $W = (N_L - 1)E = 1$ and $\Gamma_{\text{multi}} = N_L = 0.5$. The four curves correspond to different values of the number of levels in the dot: $N_L = 1; 3; 5; 1$ (from top to bottom, following the evolution of the central peak).

The temperature dependence of the electronic spectrum is presented for the three level case $N_L = 3$ in figure 2. When temperature is lowered, the zero frequency density of states starts diminishing (by Coulomb blockade of states with different charge). One then reaches a minimum, before $\rho_d(0)$ begins shooting up, towards the unitarity limit (Friedel's sum rule) at zero temperature.

It is useful to compare this evolution of the density of states to the variations of the conductance $G(T; N_L)$ with temperatures, figure 3. This figure illustrates the reduction of the Kondo temperature with Γ by the downward shifting of the minimum of conductance. The Coulomb blockade is present at higher temperature, as shown by the decrease of $G(T)$ for $T_K < T < E_c$ upon lowering T [16]. For the last curve with a continuum of states in the dot, this behavior persists up to zero temperature. The inset in log-scale on the same plot allows to grasp more clearly the saturation of conductance below the Kondo temperature.




FIG. 2: Temperature dependence of $\rho_d(\omega)$ for the case $N_L = 3$; temperatures correspond to $\Gamma = 800$ (sharp central peak), $\Gamma = 25$ (broad peak), $\Gamma = 10$ (deep minima) and $\Gamma = 2$ (shallow minima filled by thermal excitations).




FIG. 3: Conductance $G(T; N_L)$ in units of e^2/h for the same parameters as in figure 1 in function of temperature; curves with $N_L = 1; 3; 5; 1$ follow from top to bottom in the extreme left of the plot. Inset: $G(T; N_L = 1)$ in temperature-logarithmic scale.

C. Effects due to overlapping resonances in multilevel dots

The analysis in the previous section describes the usual situation where a crossover from the Coulomb blockade regime to the Kondo effect takes place as the temperature is lowered below the interlevel spacing in the dot. A different behavior can be expected when there is a set of overlapping resonances at low energies within the dot, i.e. an ensemble of levels of individual width greater than their separation, Γ , that act together as a single effective level with enhanced coupling to the leads (the typical bandwidth of this set of level should also be smaller than the charging energy). The presence of broad resonances near the Fermi level can be relevant to some experimental situations [35, 36]. Note that the conductance distributions for open ballistic quantum dots, estimated

from Random Matrix Theory are quite broad [49, 50]. We give first some qualitative arguments in order to describe the new effects expected in this regime, and then present explicit calculations using the integralequations.

1. Inverse crossover from the Kondo effect to Coulomb blockade

In practical situations encountered in quantum dots, the single-level Kondo temperature T_K is usually much smaller than the levelspacing E (which is typically comparable to E_c). Therefore Coulomb blockade occurs (if it does) inevitably before the Kondo effect sets in, as was shown at length in the previous section. There is however a simple mechanism that allows to obtain Kondo temperatures greater than both levelspacing and renormalized Coulomb energy E_c . The idea is that when the individual levelwidth exceeds the interlevelspacing E , many levels are involved in the formation of the Kondo resonance. This leads to a "multi-level Kondo temperature" [30, 31]:

$$T_K^{\text{multi}} = T_0 \exp \frac{E_c}{2N_{\text{eff}}} \quad (38)$$

which can be greatly enhanced with respect to the single level estimate, equation (35), by the presence of many levels $N_{\text{eff}} > 1$ acting together (increasing the number of channels $N_{\text{m}}ight$ also contributes to this effect). This way of enhancing the Kondo temperature allows to obtain a new regime where $T_K^{\text{multi}} > E_c$; E , so that the Kondo effect can now occur before the Coulomb blockade (when lowering the temperature), in an inverse manner as observed traditionally in quantum dots. The fact that the Coulomb energy can be strongly renormalized to smaller values adds credibility to this idea. One further notes that, at even lower temperatures, a Kondo peak associated to the formation of a resonance which involves only one electronic state in the dot will ultimately emerge. One therefore has a "two-stage Kondo effect" (if the single-level Kondo temperature is not vanishingly small).

In order to be more precise, we will first give a concrete example with a limiting case that one can understand independently of any approximation scheme. Then, we will illustrate in detail this "inverse crossover" using our integralequations.

2. Limit of exactly degenerate levels

We consider here the extreme limit in which N_L levels in the dot are simultaneously put to zero: $\epsilon_p = 0$ for all p (the total bandwidth W is therefore also zero). We can formulate the model after a redefinition of the fermionic operators (unitary transformation) $d_p^y \rightarrow c_p^y$, such

that:

$$c_1^y = \frac{1}{N_L} \sum_{p=1}^{N_L} d_p^y \quad (39)$$

In this case, the remaining fermionic degrees of freedom, c_p^y for $p > 1$, simply decouple from the problem, leaving an effective single level Anderson model describing the fermion c_1^y . Actually, a capacitive coupling persists between this fermion and all the other ones, but this influence gets frozen at low temperature. As the conductance through the dot is obtained from the Green's function:

$$G_d^{\text{loc}}(\omega) = \frac{1}{N_L} \sum_{pp'} c_p^y(\omega) d_{p'}^y(\omega) = c_1^y(\omega) c_1^y(\omega) \quad (40)$$

one gets a full Kondo effect and a complete restoration of unitary conductance at low temperature. Furthermore, the width of this effective level is simply N_L , as one checks by inserting c_1^y in equation (4). This leads then to an enhanced Kondo temperature,

$$T_K^{\text{deg}} = T_0 \exp \frac{E_c}{2N_L} \quad (41)$$

as discussed in the introductory part of this section (because $E = 0$ in this limiting case, one has $N_{\text{eff}} = N_L$).

We can easily check that our self-consistent scheme preserves this interesting property of the model. Indeed, when all levels ϵ_p are exactly degenerate ($W = 0$), one gets from equation (27) the f -electrons Green's function $G_f(i!) = [i! - \epsilon_f(i!)]^{-1}$. We obtain therefore the Kondo effect of a single effective level [40].

The following paragraph will allow us to make this discussion more meaningful, by studying the more realistic case of a quantum dot in the regime $E > E_c$, corresponding to nearly degenerate levels.

3. Inverse crossover: illustration

We now illustrate the inverse crossover discussed qualitatively in paragraph IV C 1 by solving our integralequations in the regime $E > E_c$, where multi-level effects play an important role. We will assume here that E_c is so small that one can neglect the single level Kondo effect at low temperature (see however the next paragraph). For this computation, we have fixed $\epsilon = 0.04$, and taken $N_L = 9$ states in the dot, varying the interlevelspacing from $E = 0$ (exactly degenerate level case considered in the previous paragraph) to $E = 0.01 < E_c$ (possibility of multilevel effect) to $E = 0.08 > E_c$ (absence of multilevel effect).

The low-temperature local density of states displayed in figure 4 shows the expected multi-level enhanced Kondo peak at $E = 0$ corresponding to formula (41).

Upon increasing the level spacing to $E = 0.01$, Coulomb blockade sets in at a scale $E_c < T_K^{\text{multi}}$, however coherence effects remain around T_K^{multi} (since we are in a regime with $E < T_K^{\text{multi}}$). This results in a surprising splitting of the Kondo resonance at low energy. The last curve is taken with $E = 0.08 > E_c$, so that no multilevel Kondo effect is possible, and only Coulomb blockade is observed. Another interesting consequence of this phe-




FIG. 4: Density of states $\rho_d(\omega)$ on the dot for $E_c = 1$, $\Gamma = 0.04$, inverse temperature $\beta = 400$, $N_L = 9$ states, and different values of the interlevel spacing: $E = 0; 0.01; 0.08$.

nomenon is that the temperature dependence of the conductance is reversed with respect to the usual signature of the Kondo effect in quantum dots, i.e. to figure 3. Indeed, upon lowering the temperature, one notices an initial increase of the conductance (due to the multilevel Kondo effect), then a sharp decrease of the conductance because of the Coulomb blockade. This is illustrated by the middle curve in figure 5.




FIG. 5: Conductance $G(T)$ for the same parameters as in figure 4.

One can also perform a general evaluation of the multilevel Kondo temperature, starting from the leading be-

havior of the f-Green's function at high temperature:

$$G_f^{\text{loc}}(i!) \sim \frac{1}{N_L} \sum_p \frac{1}{i! - p} \quad (42)$$

Equation (28) then leads to [58]:

$$(i) = \frac{N}{p} \sum_p \log \frac{2 + j_p j}{2 + (j_p j + T_0)^2} \quad (43)$$

The Kondo temperature is reached when this kernel is of the order of E_c , so that one finds the final equation which determines T_K^{multi} :

$$\sum_p \frac{(T_K^{\text{multi}})^2 + j_p j}{(T_K^{\text{multi}})^2 + (j_p j + T_0)^2} = \frac{T_K^2}{T_0^2} \quad (44)$$

where T_K is the single level Kondo temperature (35). A similar result was obtained previously by a renormalization group argument [30]. The limiting cases studied before are obviously contained in the previous equation: T_K^{multi} reduces to T_K for widely separated levels (E large) and in the opposite limit of exactly degenerate levels (or if $W \gg T_K^{\text{multi}}$), $T_K^{\text{multi}} = T_0 (T_K = T_0)^{1/N_L}$, consistently with equation (41). In general, T_K^{multi} is enhanced with respect to the single level Kondo temperature T_K . As an example, formula (44) shows that in the regime $E \ll T_K^{\text{multi}}$, $T_K^{\text{multi}} \approx E_c$, one obtains then $T_K^{\text{multi}} \approx T_0 \exp[-E_c/E] = (2N T_K^{\text{multi}})$, so that the number of effective levels taking part to the multilevel Kondo resonance is $N_{\text{eff}} = T_K^{\text{multi}}/E$, as discussed qualitatively in equation (38).

We conclude this paragraph by summing up the physical picture that leads to the observed non-monotonous conductance. In the case of many overlapping resonances, a quantum dot can be described as a small metallic grain dominated by Coulomb blockade at low temperature, which implies a vanishing zero-frequency density of states. Upon raising the temperature, many different charge states become available by the thermal smearing of the Coulomb blockade, and the conductance is rapidly increasing on a scale of the order of E_c (which is also the typical size of the dip observed in the split Kondo peak). Due to the large single level width considered in this regime, all these energy levels can then act coherently as a localized spin degree of freedom that undergoes the Kondo effect. This explains the upturn of the conductance when temperature reaches the Kondo energy T_K^{multi} .

4. Two-stage Kondo effect

Finally we consider again a multilevel case, $E \ll T_K^{\text{multi}}$, but now with $E_c < E$, so that the single-level Kondo resonance is accessible to the low temperature regime. Therefore, one witnesses a further increase of the conductance

at low temperature, taking place after the inverse Kondo-to-Coulomb crossover that we discussed previously. The occurrence of such a "two-stage Kondo effect" is depicted for the conductances shown in figure 6. For this calculation,




FIG. 6: Conductance $G(T)$ in the case $N_L = 5$, $\Gamma = 0.1$ and various level spacings: $E = 0; 0.025; 0.05; 0.1; 0.25$.

tion, we have taken $N_L = 5$ levels, $\Gamma = 0.1$ and various level spacings between zero and 2.5 .

The two curves with $0 < E < 0.1$ show indeed this two-stage Kondo effect: a first rise of the conductance at high temperature due to the multilevel resonance at $T = T_K^{multi}$, then the Coulomb blockade at $T = E_c$ and then a further increase at $T = T_K$ (smallest scale of the problem). The last two curves, with $E = 0.1; 0.25$, show the usual crossover that was illustrated on the figure 3 in section IV B 3.

A last point that was checked is that our results are weakly sensitive to the addition of more levels outside the energy window of width Γ . This calculation is shown in figure 7.

5. Summary of the different regimes of transport

A sketch of the different regimes analyzed in this paper is given in figure 8, as a function of the level spacing, E , and single level width, Γ . We assume that the number of electrons in the dot is odd, so that the ground state, in the absence of the coupling to the leads is degenerate. The transition between different regimes is a smooth crossover. We will not discuss in the following the effect of the renormalization of the charging energy, therefore the zone boundaries that locate the different regimes will not be determined here. However, this can be done in practice by solving the integral equations, as discussed in the body of the paper. Also it would be interesting to perform a full Renormalization Group analysis of the renormalization of both T_K and E_c along the lines of [31, 51].




FIG. 7: Lower curve: conductance $G(T)$ in the case $N_L = 5$, $\Gamma = 0.1$ and $E = 0.015$. Upper curve: similar model, but 10 additional levels (with larger spacing $E^0 = 0.2$) have been superimposed to the previous ones.

The occurrence of Kondo effect is signaled by a non monotonous temperature dependance of the conductance, and is observable at E_c for temperatures smaller than the single-level Kondo temperature T_K given by equation (35). Depending on the relative values of level spacing E and Coulomb energy E_c , Coulomb blockade might also be present above the Kondo temperature, which is the usual experimental situation encountered in quantum dots. We emphasize that if Γ is much smaller than E_c the Kondo temperature is extremely small and the Kondo effect is unobservable in practice; this corresponds to weakly coupled dots, and this situation shows only Coulomb blockade. In the case $E_c \ll \Gamma$ we have defined a region "MultiLevel" which corresponds actually to various regimes discussed previously. This describes the inverse crossover (Kondo to Coulomb Blockade), as well as the two-stage Kondo effect shown in section IV C 4. This region can also imply that the Kondo effect is observed in the usual manner, but with a Kondo temperature greater than the single-level estimate. Note that the Kondo effect involving many levels can also occur in dots with an even number of electrons, in a similar manner to the Kondo resonance which arises at a singlet-triplet crossing in an applied magnetic field [52]. Finally, the region $E_c > \Gamma$ of the diagram (denoted "Coherent") is associated with large conductances that are weakly modulated with temperature or applied gate voltage.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we have presented a method of calculation for strongly correlated mesoscopic systems in terms of a collective phase variable and the quasiparticle degrees of freedom. The scheme is valid both for the study of the Coulomb blockade regime and of the Kondo effect.




FIG. 8: Sketch of the different regimes discussed in the paper, as function of the charging energy, E_c , level spacing within the dot, δE , and level widths, Γ , with a constant number of levels. The notation "Kondo" corresponds to a single-level Kondo effect. The region "Kondo + Coulomb Blockade" is the usual situation in quantum dots. The "Multilevel" region is also associated to the Kondo effect, but with important renormalization of the Kondo temperature, as discussed in the text. The "Coherent" regime stands for a temperature independent conductance.

We have shown examples of the crossover between a Coulomb blockade regime at temperatures below the charging energy, and the formation of a Kondo resonance at temperatures lower than the separation between levels within the dot. In addition, we have described an inverse regime, where a Kondo like resonance is splitted at low energies by Coulomb blockade effects. This regime is as-

sociated to the existence of many conduction channels, or overlapping resonances within the dot, which contribute collectively to the Kondo effect. The coherence of this state is destroyed at low energies by Coulomb effects. At even lower energies, a narrow Kondo peak, associated to a single level within the dot, will emerge.

Because the self-consistent approach used here was successfully applied to model of strongly correlated electrons (Hubbard model) in a previous work [40], we can also envision possible applications of this work to the physics of granular materials or quantum dot arrays in the vicinity of the metal-insulator transition [53, 54, 55, 56]. Disorder effects, that were neglected here, should also be included in future work along these lines.

Other possible development is an exact (numerical) solution of the self-consistent action (11-12) instead of taking the spherical limit as was done in section IV A, which brings some limitations (as the restriction to valleys of conduction). Also importantly, we believe that the present work, both by the technical concepts and the physical ideas, connects in an original manner the fields of strongly correlated systems and mesoscopic physics.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

SF and AG are grateful to D. Esteve, H. Pothier and C. Urbina for a useful discussion. We appreciate the hospitality of the Kavli Institute of Theoretical Physics, where this work was initiated. The KITP is supported by NSF through grant PHY 99-07949. P. San Jose and F. Guinea are thankful to MCyT (Spain) for financial support through grant MAT2002-04095-CO2-01. SF acknowledges the support of the CNRS-PPICS (1062) program.

-
- [1] M. Kastner, Rev. Mod. Phys. 64, 849 (1992).
 - [2] H. Grabert and M. Devoret, eds., Single Electron Tunneling (Plenum Press, 1992).
 - [3] Y. Aharassid, Rev. Mod. Phys. 72, 895 (2000).
 - [4] L. L. A. Leiner, P. W. Brouwer, and L. I. Glazman, Phys. Rep. 358, 309 (2002).
 - [5] D. V. Averin and K. K. Likharev, in Mesoscopic Phenomena in Solids, edited by B. L. Altshuler, P. A. Lee, and R. A. Webb (Elsevier, 1991).
 - [6] T. A. Fulton and G. J. Dolan, Phys. Rev. Lett. 59, 109 (1987).
 - [7] P. Lafarge, H. Pothier, E. R. Williams, D. Esteve, C. Urbina, and M. H. Devoret, Z. Phys. B 85, 327 (1991).
 - [8] P. Joyez, V. Bouchiat, D. Esteve, C. Urbina, and M. H. Devoret, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 1349 (1997).
 - [9] J. Kondo, Prog. Theor. Phys. 32, 37 (1964).
 - [10] A. Hewson, The Kondo problem to heavy fermions (Cambridge, 1996).
 - [11] L. I. Glazman and M. E. Raikh, JETP Lett. 47, 452 (1988).
 - [12] T. K. Ng and P. A. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. 61, 1768 (1988).
 - [13] D. Goldhaber-Gordon, H. Shtrikman, D. Mahalu, D. A. Busch-Magder, U. Meirav, and M. A. Kastner, Nature 391, 156 (1998).
 - [14] S. M. Cronenwett, T. H. Oosterkamp, and L. P. Kouwenhoven, Science 281, 540 (1998).
 - [15] L. Kouwenhoven and L. Glazman, Physics World 14, 33 (2001).
 - [16] L. I. Glazman and M. Pustilnik (2003), cond-mat/0302159.
 - [17] T. L. Ho, Phys. Rev. Lett. 51, 2060 (1983).
 - [18] E. Ben-Jacob, E. Mottola, and G. Schon, Phys. Rev. Lett. 51, 2064 (1983).
 - [19] G. Goppert and H. Grabert, Phys. Rev. B 63, 125307 (2001).
 - [20] F. Guinea and G. Schon, Europhys. Lett. 1, 585 (1986).
 - [21] S. V. Panyukov and A. D. Zaikin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 67, 3168 (1991).
 - [22] G. Schon and A. D. Zaikin, Phys. Rep. 198, 237 (1990).
 - [23] G. Goppert, X. Wang, and H. Grabert, Phys. Rev. B 55, 10213 (1997).
 - [24] P. Joyez, D. Esteve, and M. H. Devoret, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 1956 (1998).
 - [25] D. S. Golubev, J. König, H. Schoeller, G. Schon, and A. D. Zaikin, Phys. Rev. B 56, 15782 (1997).
 - [26] C. P. Herrero, G. Schon, and A. D. Zaikin, Phys. Rev. B

- 59, 5728 (1999).
- [27] P. W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. 124, 41 (1961).
- [28] Y. Meir, N. S. Wingreen, and P. A. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. 66, 3048 (1991).
- [29] M. Pustilnik and L. I. Glazman, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 216601 (2001).
- [30] K. Yamada, K. Yosida, and K. Hanzawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. 71, 450 (1984).
- [31] T. Inoshita, A. Shimizu, Y. Kuramoto, and H. Sakaki, Phys. Rev. B 48, 14725 (1993).
- [32] T. Pohjola, J. König, M. M. Salmaa, J. Schmid, H. Schoeller, and G. Schon, Europhys. Lett. 40, 189 (1997).
- [33] J. J. Palacios, L. Liu, and D. Yoshioka, Phys. Rev. B 55, 15735 (1999).
- [34] A. L. Yeyati, F. Flores, and A. Martín-Rodero, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 600 (1999).
- [35] P. G. Silvestrov and Y. Imry, Phys. Rev. Lett. 85, 2565 (2000).
- [36] P. G. Silvestrov and Y. Imry, Phys. Rev. B 65, 035309 (2001).
- [37] W. Hofstetter and H. Schoeller, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 016803 (2002).
- [38] F. Guinea, Phys. Rev. B 67, 195104 (2003).
- [39] C. Fuhner, U. F. Keyser, R. J. Haug, D. Reuter, and A. D. Wieck, Phys. Rev. B 66, 161305 (2002).
- [40] S. Florens and A. Georges, Phys. Rev. B 66, 165111 (2002).
- [41] T. P. Ruschke and N. Grewe, Z. Phys. B 74, 439 (1989).
- [42] O. Parcollet and A. Georges, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 4665 (1997).
- [43] D. Chouvaev, L. S. Kuzmin, D. S. Golubev, and A. D. Zaikin, Phys. Rev. B 59, 10599 (1999).
- [44] N. E. Bickers, Rev. Mod. Phys. 59, 845 (1987).
- [45] S. Renn (1997), cond-mat/9708194.
- [46] S. Drewes, D. P. Arovas, and S. Renn (2003), cond-mat/0301396.
- [47] S. Sachdev, Quantum Phase Transitions (Cambridge, 2000).
- [48] T. A. Costi (2002), cond-mat/0212651.
- [49] H. U. Baranger and P. A. Mello, Phys. Rev. Lett. 73, 142 (1994).
- [50] R. A. Jalabert, J.-L. Pichard, and C. W. J. Beenakker, Europhys. Lett. 27, 255 (1994).
- [51] J. König and H. Schoeller, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 3511 (1998).
- [52] D. Giuliano, B. Jouault, and A. Tagliacozzo, Phys. Rev. B 63, 125318 (2001).
- [53] D. P. Arovas, F. Guinea, C. Herrero, and P. San Jose, Phys. Rev. B, in press, cond-mat/0211686.
- [54] K. B. Efetov and A. Tschersich, Europhys. Lett. 59, 114 (2002).
- [55] C. A. Staord and S. DasSarma, Phys. Rev. Lett. 72, 3590 (1994).
- [56] A. V. Herzog, P. Xiong, F. Shari, and R. C. Dynes, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 668 (1996).
- [57] We have renormalized the Coulomb energy by a factor of two to obtain the correct solution in the atomic limit, see [40].
- [58] Naively the cut-off T_0 in this expression should be of order as implied by the regularized expression of the bath $\chi(\omega) = N_L \frac{1}{\omega} \exp(-\beta \hbar \omega) = \chi(\omega)$. However logarithmic corrections to our approximative derivation imply that $T_0 \propto \frac{p}{E_c}$.