arXiv:cond-mat/0308137v1 [cond-mat.mes-hall] 7 Aug 2003

Scattering Theory of Noise: Current and Charge Fluctuations in an ideal Conductor.

G.B. Lesovik

L.D. Landau Institute of Theoretical Physics, Russian Academy of Science,

Kosygina str.2, 117940 Moscow,Russia.

Abstract

We present the most complete scattering theory for noise in noninteracting case. The exact formula for spectral density of current fluctuations at finite frequency is presented in terms of scattering matrix for a coherent quantum conductor. We show that the shot noise at finite frequency in an ideally conducting contact is finite and the spectral density of the noise has a singularity at the "Josephson" frequency $\omega = eV/\hbar$, set by the voltage. We also discuss fluctuations of charge in an ideal conductor.

The manuscript is a revised and corrected version of JETP Lett.,**70**, 208 (1999). The discussion about charge fluctuations is restored (dropped from the JETPL text due to limitation in space).

In an ideal conductor with electron transmission equal to unity ($T = 1$) the low-frequency shot noise is suppressed. This has been shown theoretically, using quantum-mechanical description in terms of the scattering matrix, for a quantum point contact [1–4], and even earlier, using kinetic equation for Fermions [5] and semi-classical Green's functions description [6], for ballistic point contacts. It has been also confirmed experimentally [7,8] for quantum point contacts. The same phenomenon has been predicted theoretically [9] and confirmed experimentally [10,11] for conductors in the fractional quantum Hall effect regime.

Nonetheless, at finite frequency the noise remains *finite* even in an ideal quantum conductor, and it is this effect that is discussed in the present letter.

In a conductor where electron transport can be adequately described in a model of noninteracting electrons using the scattering matrix, the spectral density of the shot noise at zero frequency is given by [1–4],

$$S(0) = 2e^3V/h \sum_n T_n(1 - T_n), \tag{1}$$

where V is the bias, e is the charge of electron, T_n is the transmission in the eigenchannel n, h is Planck's constant, and the temperature Θ is assumed to be zero. From this expression it follows directly that shot noise is completely suppressed for $T = 1$.

The behavior of shot noise only with $T = 1$ at low frequencies has been discussed qualitatively many times, and we shall repeat only briefly the corresponding arguments. The first condition for the existence of shot noise is discreteness of the electron charge. Indeed, if the charge is set equal to zero at a fixed current, then the noise vanishes, since from (1) it follows that $S(0)/I \propto e$.

At zero temperature and finite voltage the only reason for fluctuations of current (besides the already mentioned discreteness of the charge) transported by noninteracting electrons is the probabilistic nature of tunneling through a barrier (or scattering by impurities), more accurately, the probabilistic nature of the measurement process in which the electrons are detected either in left-hand reservoir (electrons which have been reflected from a barrier) or in right-hand reservoir (electrons which have passed through a barrier). Therefore, if the transmission T becomes unity, this reason for fluctuations disappears. The absence of low-frequency fluctuations due to the irregularity of the electron injection from a reservoir is due to the fact that electrons obey Fermi statistics.

We shall now discuss noise at a finite frequency. To understand why noise is finite in this case, we must refine the arguments presented above. Noise at zero frequency could be related to fluctuations of the charge transported through the conductor in time t as follows [12]: $\lim_{t\to\infty}\langle(\delta Q_t)^2\rangle/t = S(0)$.

For this reason, if fluctuations of the transported charge grow slower than t, noise at zero frequency is zero. This is what happens for a conductor with $T = 1$.

At the same time, even in an ideal conductor at zero temperature and finite voltage transmitted charge fluctuations are not zero:

$\langle(\delta Q_t)^2\rangle = 2e^2/\pi^2 \ln t\Omega + e^2/4\pi^2[(eV/2\epsilon_F)^2 - \sin^2(eVt/2\hbar)(\hbar/\epsilon_F t)^2]$,

where Ω is a cutoff frequency and ϵ_F is the Fermi energy. The first term in this expression is related with the existence of zero-point fluctuations [13] and, in turn, with the fact that the Fermi correlations cannot completely suppress fluctuations and fix the position of electrons relative to one another. The second term depends on the applied voltage and is (conventionally speaking) a result of fluctuations which are due to the transitions of left-moving electrons into right-moving electrons and vice versa.

The finiteness of the noise at finite frequency can now be argued as follows. Although for $T = 1$ a wave packet leaving one reservoir completely passes into the other reservoir and the probability of detecting an electron there in time approaches unity, the charge transport process is nonetheless not completely uniform in time, and oscillations occur at the frequency of the applied voltage. Specifically, for a symmetrized current current correlation function the main (at long times $t \gg \hbar/eV$) contribution to the oscillatory dependence has the form

$\langle I(0)I(t)\rangle = \frac{e^2}{\pi^2}\frac{(eV)^3}{8\epsilon_F^2\hbar t}\sin(eVt/\hbar)$.

Technically, the existence of such fluctuations is due to the fact that the matrix element of the current operator between two plane waves with opposite signs of wave vectors,

$\langle\exp(ik_1x)|\hat{I}|\exp(-ik_2x)\rangle = \frac{ie\hbar}{2m}[-ik_1 + ik_2]\exp(-[ik_1 + ik_2]x)$,

is nonzero if the absolute magnitudes of the wave vectors are not equal to one another. This gives rise to transitions between left-moving and right-moving electrons. At zero frequency such transitions do not contribute to single-particle quantities, such as conductivity, but they do appear in the two-particle correlation function, specifically, in the current correlation function. Note, that in the linear spectrum approximation, the effect vanishes.

We shall now calculate the total current correlation function whence follow the expressions presented above. The description of transport in a nonequilibrium system can be given

most systematically using Keldysh's approach [15].

In this approach to transport, just as with the use of kinetic equation, the deviation from equilibrium caused by the presence of an electromotive force in the circuit is described by prescribing boundary conditions on the "Keldysh" or "$-+$" Green's function $G_{-+}(x_1, x_2) = i\langle\Psi^\dagger(x_2)\Psi(x_1)\rangle$ at the edges:

$$G_{-+}(x_1, x_2)|_{x_n=X_\beta} = G^{eq}_{-+}(X_\beta, X_\beta) \tag{2}$$

Here $G^{eq}_{-+}(X_\beta, X_\beta)$ is the equilibrium Green's function in the reservoir β. It can be shown that for noninteracting system of electrons this approach is completely equivalent to the approach developed by Landauer and others [16]. In Landauer's approach it is assumed that the electrons leaving different reservoirs are uncorrelated. The occupation numbers for the corresponding states are determined by the chemical potential and the temperature in the corresponding reservoir. Electron scattering by a static potential inside the conductor connecting the reservoirs can be described purely quantum mechanically using wave functions which are exact solutions of the scattering problem. What we have said above can be conveniently described in the second-quantization formalism.

The electronic ψ - operators are written in a basis of Lippman-Schwinger scattering states $\hat{\Psi}(r) = \sum_{\alpha,\epsilon,n} \hat{c}_{\alpha,\epsilon,n}\varphi_{\alpha,\epsilon,n}(r)$ which have (in the reservoir β) the asymptotic form

$$\varphi_{\alpha,\beta,\epsilon,n}(r) = \frac{\exp(-ik_{nn}|x|)}{\sqrt{v_{nn}}}\chi_{\beta,\epsilon,n,-}(y)\delta_{\beta,\alpha} + \sum_m S_{\alpha,\beta,\epsilon,n,m}\frac{\exp(+ik_{nm}|x|)}{\sqrt{v_{nm}}}\chi_{\beta,\epsilon,m,+}(y). \tag{3}$$

The creation operators $\hat{c}^\dagger_{\alpha,\epsilon,n}$ create states of electrons emitted from reservoir α with energy E in the transverse channel n. To make the expression less heavy, the conductor is assumed to be two-dimensional. The functions $\chi_{\beta,\epsilon,m,\pm}(y)$ describe motion along the y axis. In the presence of magnetic field these functions describe two different classes of the edge states (left-moving and right-moving), and we introduce indices $\pm$ for these two classes. It is necessary, because the wave vectors are chosen to be positive. The magnitudes of the wave vectors are defined by the equality $\hbar^2 k^2_{nm} + \epsilon_m = \epsilon$, where ϵ_m is the quantization energy in the mth transverse mode (channel).

The density matrix of the system can be written, in accordance with the assumption that the reservoirs are uncorrelated, as a direct product of independent factors describing each reservoir:

$$\hat{\rho} = \Pi_\alpha \exp(-\sum_{\epsilon,n} \hat{c}^\dagger_{\alpha,\epsilon,n}\hat{c}_{\alpha,\epsilon,n}(\epsilon-\mu_\alpha)]/\theta_\alpha)/\mathbf{Tr}\hat{\rho}. \tag{4}$$

where μ_α and θ_α are the chemical potential and temperature in reservoir α.

Now using Eqs. (3)-(4) to calculate the correlation function of the total currents in the reservoirs β' and β in the sections x_1 and x_2 at finite frequency,

$$\langle\langle I_{-\omega}(\beta',x_1)I_\omega(\beta,x_2)\rangle\rangle = \int dt \exp(i\omega t)\mathbf{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}\hat{I}_{\beta'}(x_1)e^{i\hat{H}t}\hat{I}_\beta(x_2)e^{-i\hat{H}t}\} - \langle\hat{I}_{\beta'}(x_1)\rangle\langle\hat{I}_\beta(x_2)\rangle, \tag{5}$$

(here $\hat{H} = \sum_{\alpha,\epsilon,n}\hat{c}^\dagger_{\alpha,\epsilon,n}\hat{c}_{\alpha,\epsilon,n}\epsilon$), we obtain the expression

$$\langle\langle I_{-\omega}(\beta',x_1)I_\omega(\beta,x_2)\rangle\rangle = 2e^2\sum_{\alpha'n'\alpha n}\int\frac{d\epsilon}{h}n_{\alpha'}(\epsilon')[1-n_\alpha(\epsilon)]J^{\beta'\alpha'\epsilon'n'}_{\beta'\alpha\epsilon n}(x_1)J^{\beta\alpha\epsilon n}_{\beta\alpha'\epsilon'n'}(x_2) \quad . \tag{6}$$

Here (and in the formulas below) $\epsilon' = \epsilon + \hbar\omega$, $\epsilon' = \epsilon(k')$, and Zeeman splitting is neglected. The index β enumerates the reservoirs where the current is measured and the index α enumerates the reservoirs from which electrons are injected. The current matrix elements can be expressed in terms of the scattering matrix elements $S_{\alpha,\beta,\epsilon,n,m}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} J^{\beta\alpha'\epsilon'n'}_{\beta\alpha\epsilon n} = \sum_{m',m} S^*_{\alpha',\beta,\epsilon',n,m}S_{\alpha,\beta,\epsilon,n,m} \times \\ \times\left(\frac{e\hbar(k'_{n',m'}+k_{n,m})}{2M}\langle m'\epsilon'_+|m\epsilon_+\rangle - \frac{e^2}{Mc}\langle m'\epsilon'_+|A_x(y)|m\epsilon_+\rangle\right)\frac{\exp(-i(k'_{n',m'}-k_{n,m})x)}{\sqrt{v'_{n'm'}v_{nm}}} + \\ \left(\frac{e\hbar(-k'_{n,n}-k_{n,n})}{2M}\langle n\epsilon'_-|n\epsilon_-\rangle - \frac{e^2}{Mc}\langle n\epsilon'_-|A_x(y)|n\epsilon_-\rangle\right)\frac{\exp(i(k'_{n,n}-k_{n,n})x)}{v_{nn}}\delta_{\beta,\alpha'}\delta_{\beta,\alpha} + \\ S^*_{\alpha',\beta,\epsilon',n',m'}\left(\frac{e\hbar(k'_{n',m'}-k_{n,n})}{2M}\langle m'\epsilon'_+|n\epsilon_-\rangle - \frac{e^2}{Mc}\langle m'\epsilon'_+|A_x(y)|n\epsilon_-\rangle\right)\times \\ \times\frac{\exp(-i(k'_{n',m'}+k_{n,n})x)}{\sqrt{v'_{n'm'}v_{nn}}}\delta_{\beta,\alpha} + \\ S_{\alpha,\beta,\epsilon,n,m}\left(\frac{e\hbar(-k'_{n',n'}+k_{n,m})}{2M}\langle n'\epsilon'_-|m\epsilon_+\rangle - \frac{e^2}{Mc}\langle n'\epsilon'_-|A_x(y)|m\epsilon_+\rangle\right)\times \\ \times\frac{\exp(i(k'_{n',n'}+k_{n,m})x)}{\sqrt{v'_{n'n'}v_{nm}}}\delta_{\beta,\alpha'} \ , \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

here $v = \partial\epsilon(k)/\hbar\partial k$, $x = |x|$, and k-vectors at the given energy are taken in the lead β. Note, that the positive direction of motion is from the origin (scattering region) to the infinity in each lead, like in polar co-ordinates system.

The last two terms in the expressions presented above are zero at zero frequency, and these are the terms that give finite noise at finite frequency in an ideal conductor, where the scattering matrix has the trivial form (for two reservoirs denoted by the indices L and R) $|S_{\alpha,\beta,\epsilon,n,m}|^2 = \delta_{L,\alpha}\delta_{R,\beta}\delta_{n,m} + \delta_{R,\alpha}\delta_{L,\beta}\delta_{n,m}$.

In the presence of a magnetic field the overlap of the transverse wave functions is $\langle n'\epsilon'_+|m\epsilon_-\rangle = \int dy \chi^*_{\epsilon',n',+}(y)\chi_{\epsilon,n,-}(y)$, and the matrix element $\langle n'\epsilon'_+|A_x(y)|m\epsilon_-\rangle) = \int dy \chi^*_{\epsilon',n',+}(y)A(y)\chi_{\epsilon,n,-}(y)$ depends on the energies and the signs of the k vectors ($\pm$).

The contributions of interest to us, which are due to the nonlinearity of the spectrum, contain matrix elements of the transverse wave functions describing the edge states on two different edges. If the width of the conductor d is much greater than the effective magnetic length, $d \gg \tilde{a}_H$, then noise in an ideal conductor at finite frequency is exponentially suppressed.

Without a magnetic field $\langle m'|m\rangle = \delta_{m',m}$. In this case for single channel in the same lead ("right" one) we obtain

$$\langle\langle \hat{I}_{-\omega}(x_1)\hat{I}_{\omega}(x_2)\rangle\rangle = \frac{2e^2\hbar^2}{(2m)^2}\int \frac{d\epsilon}{v_{\epsilon'}v_{\epsilon}h} \quad (8)$$
$$\{n_L(\epsilon')(1-n_L(\epsilon))(k+k')^2 T_{\epsilon'}T_{\epsilon}e^{i(k-k')(x_1-x_2)}$$
$$+n_L(\epsilon')(1-n_R(\epsilon))[(k+k')^2T_{\epsilon'}(1-T_{\epsilon})e^{i(k-k')(x_1-x_2)} +$$
$$(k'^2-k^2)T_{\epsilon'}e^{-ik'(x_1-x_2)}(r_{\epsilon}e^{ik(x_1+x_2)}+r^*_{\epsilon}e^{-ik(x_1+x_2)}) + (k'-k)^2T_{\epsilon'}e^{-i(k+k')(x_1-x_2)}]$$
$$n_R(\epsilon')(1-n_L(\epsilon))[(k+k')^2T_{\epsilon}(1-T_{\epsilon'})e^{i(k-k')(x_1-x_2)} +$$
$$(k^2-k'^2)T_{\epsilon}e^{ik(x_1-x_2)}(r_{\epsilon'}e^{ik'(x_1+x_2)}+r^*_{\epsilon'}e^{-ik'(x_1+x_2)}) + (k'-k)^2T_{\epsilon}e^{i(k+k')(x_1-x_2)}]$$
$$n_R(\epsilon')(1-n_R(\epsilon))[(k+k')^2e^{-i(k-k')(x_1-x_2)} + (k+k')^2R_{\epsilon'}R_{\epsilon}e^{i(k-k')(x_1-x_2)} -$$
$$-(k+k')^2[r^*_{\epsilon'}r_{\epsilon}e^{i(k-k')(x_1+x_2)} + r^*_{\epsilon}r_{\epsilon'}e^{-i(k-k')(x_1+x_2)}] +$$
$$(k^2-k'^2)[r^*_{\epsilon}e^{-i(k-k')x_1-i(k+k')x_2} - r_{\epsilon'}e^{i(k+k')x_2} + r^*_{\epsilon'}e^{i(k-k')x_2}e^{-i(k+k')x_1} - r_{\epsilon}e^{i(k+k')x_1}] +$$
$$(k^2-k'^2)[r^*_{\epsilon'}R_{\epsilon}e^{i(k-k')x_1-i(k+k')x_2} - r_{\epsilon}R_{\epsilon'}e^{i(k+k')x_2} -$$
$$R_{\epsilon'}r^*_{\epsilon}e^{-i(k-k')x_2-i(k+k')x_1} - R_{\epsilon}r_{\epsilon'}e^{i(k+k')x_1}] -$$
$$(k-k')^2[r^*_{\epsilon'}e^{-i(k+k')x_1} - r_{\epsilon}e^{i(k+k')x_1}][r^*_{\epsilon}e^{-i(k+k')x_2} - r_{\epsilon'}e^{i(k+k')x_2}]]\},$$

where $R_\epsilon = |r_\epsilon|^2 = 1 - T_\epsilon$, and $n_{R(L)}$ are the occupation numbers in right (left) reservoir. From this expression we obtain the estimate $(1-T) \ll (\hbar\omega)^2/\epsilon_F^2$ for values of the transmissions at which the "unusual" contributions are substantial at finite frequency.

We shall now write out an expression for the noise in a quantum point contact, if one channel is completely opened and the wave functions can be represented in the quasiclassical form

$$\langle\langle \hat{I}_{-\omega}(x_1)\hat{I}_{\omega}(x_2)\rangle\rangle = \frac{2e^2\hbar^2}{(2m)^2}\int \frac{d\epsilon}{h}\{\frac{4\omega^2}{(v_1'+v_1)(v_2'+v_2)\sqrt{v_1'v_2'v_1v_2}} \quad (9)$$
$$\{n_L(\epsilon')(1-n_R(\epsilon))\exp(-i\int_{x_1}^{x_2}(k'(x)+k(x))dx) +$$
$$n_R(\epsilon')(1-n_L(\epsilon))\exp(i\int_{x_1}^{x_2}(k'(x)+k(x))dx)\} +$$
$$\frac{(k_1'+k_1)(k_2'+k_2)}{\sqrt{v_1'v_2'v_1v_2}}\{n_L(\epsilon')(1-n_L(\epsilon))(\exp(-i\int_{x_1}^{x_2}(k'(x)-k(x))dx)$$
$$n_R(\epsilon')(1-n_R(\epsilon))\exp(i\int_{x_1}^{x_2}(k'(x)-k(x))dx)\}\}.$$

For the part giving shot noise at coinciding co-ordinates we have

$$\langle\langle \hat{I}_{-\omega}(x)\hat{I}_{\omega}(x)\rangle\rangle = \tag{10}$$
$$\frac{e^2\hbar^2}{(2m)^2}\int \frac{d\epsilon}{\hbar 2\pi}\frac{4\omega^2[n_L(\epsilon')(1-n_R(\epsilon))+n_R(\epsilon')(1-n_L(\epsilon))]}{(v_{k'}(x)+v_k(x))(v_{k'}(x)+v_k(x)v_{k'}(x)v_k(x)}$$

It is evident from this expression that the fluctuations are big near a constriction, where the kinetic energy of the longitudinal motion is minimal, and they decrease into the reservoir.

The frequency dependence has a singularity at $\hbar\omega = eV$, similar to that studied previously in a normal contact with scattering [19,20] and in a contact between Luttinger liquids [21].

For a symmetrized correlation function at voltages much lower than the minimum of the effective Fermi energy $\epsilon_F(x) = \epsilon_F - \epsilon_1(x)$, the spectral density has the form

$$\langle\langle \frac{1}{2}[\hat{I}_{-\omega}(x)\hat{I}_{\omega}(x) + \hat{I}_{\omega}(x)\hat{I}_{-\omega}(x)]\rangle\rangle = \frac{2e^2}{h}(\hbar\omega + \frac{(\hbar\omega)^2}{16\epsilon_F^2(x)}f(\hbar\omega)), \tag{11}$$

where $f(\hbar\omega) = eV$ for frequencies $\hbar\omega < eV$, and $f(\hbar\omega) = \hbar\omega$ if $\hbar\omega > eV$. Such a singularity can by observed in direct measurements [22] and in an experiment with an additional external frequency; see Refs.20 and 23. In experiments where the noise is measured at a finite frequency, if the measurements are performed using a resonant circuit with high Q, only "positive frequency" makes a contribution, and the excess noise is $\frac{e^2(\hbar\omega)^2}{h8\epsilon_F^2(x)}(eV - \hbar\omega)$ [24].

Now we turn to a discussion of the spatial dependence of the obtained correlators. Physically it is clear that for stationary process the zero-frequency correlator $\langle I_{-\omega}(x_1)I_{\omega}(x_2)\rangle|_{\omega=0}$ should not depend on the co-ordinates, because such a dependence would mean charge accumulation in time. Let us prove this statement formally.

It follows from the Shroedinger equation that the matrix element of the current operator, taken between two states of the system with the energies E and $E' = E + \hbar\omega$ obeys the equation $\partial/\partial x\langle E+\hbar\omega, \alpha|I(x)|E,\beta\rangle = -ie\omega\Psi^*_{E+\hbar\omega,\alpha}(x)\Psi_{E,\beta}(x)$, and therefore at zero frequency the x-dependence vanishes.

In addition, since we consider stationary process, the density matrix must be diagonal in the energy representation: $\langle E'|\hat{\rho}|E\rangle \propto \delta(E'-E)$. Using these facts, we conclude that the correlator

$\langle I_{-\omega}(x_1)I_{\omega}(x_2)\rangle|_{\omega=0} = \sum_{\alpha,\beta,E}\langle\alpha, E|\hat{\rho}|\beta, E\rangle\langle E,\beta|I(x_1)|E,\gamma\rangle\langle E,\gamma|I(x_2)|E\alpha\rangle$

at zero frequency also does not depend on the co-ordinates x_1, x_2.

One checks, that the correlator (8) indeed loses its co-ordinate dependence in the zero-frequency limit, but this limit is nontrivial in fact, as we discuss below.

In the specific contributions in the correlator we are discussing the functional dependence on the co-ordinates remains strong even in the zero-frequency limit, $\sim \exp(ik_F x)$, nevertheless the coefficient in front of such terms vanishes as second (or first) degree of the frequency. In the remaining "usual" terms in the correlator, which give finite contribution at zero frequency the functional dependence becomes weak by itself $\sim \exp(i\omega/v_F x)$.

Charge fluctuations. At the same time, in the charge fluctuations all kinds of terms give comparable contribution. This fact was also noted for normal conductors in [25], and considered for normal metal-superconductor system in [26].

Charge fluctuations in a volume between sections x_1, x_2 can be expressed via already known current correlators:

$\langle\langle Q^2_\omega(x_1,x_2)\rangle\rangle = \frac{1}{\omega^2}\langle\langle I_{-\omega}(x_1)I_\omega(x_1) - I_{-\omega}(x_1)I_\omega(x_2) - I_{-\omega}(x_2)I_\omega(x_1) + I_{-\omega}(x_2)I_\omega(x_2)\rangle\rangle$,

At frequencies much less than minimal Fermi energy $\min\{mv_F^2(x)/2\}$ for the open channel we obtain for the charge fluctuations in the volume $[x_1, x_2]$:

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\langle Q^2_\omega(x_1,x_2)\rangle\rangle = \frac{2e^2}{h}\int d\epsilon\{[n_L(\epsilon')(1-n_L(\epsilon)) + n_R(\epsilon')(1-n_R(\epsilon))]\frac{4\sin^2(\omega\tau/2)}{\omega^2} \\ +[n_L(\epsilon')(1-n_R(\epsilon)) + n_R(\epsilon')(1-n_L(\epsilon))]\frac{\hbar^2}{4m^2v_1^4v_2^4}\times \\ \times[(v_1^2-v_2^2)^2 + 4v_1^2v_2^2\sin^2(\int_{x_1}^{x_2} k(x)dx + \omega\tau/2)]\},\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where $v_i = v_F(x_i)$, $\tau = \int_{x_1}^{x_2} dx/v_F(x)$.

In the present article we consider strictly noninteracting picture, but we expect the main statement about the finiteness of current and charge fluctuations in an ideal conductor to be correct also in presence of interaction. It is clear, nevertheless, that an interaction may play important role in the considered effect. For example Coulomb interaction will be important for "transmission" of the fluctuations through wires into measuring devises [27].

Besides, in the presence of interaction an additional singularities may appear at frequencies which are multiple of the inverted traveling time of one electron $\omega = n2\pi I/e, n = 1, 2, ...$ These singularities are in general different from the one we discussed (at $\omega = eV/\hbar$), the latter being due to the interference between states from the reservoirs at different chemical potentials.

It is also interesting to note, that since it is nonlinear dispersion which is responsible for a finite noise in an ideal conductor, the effect will be invisible in the usual Luttinger liquid description. In that case accounting for the deviation from the linear dispersion as a term in Hamiltonian, mixing "left" and "right" moving electrons is needed.

In closing, we note that in previously presented expressions for noise at finite frequency [1,19] the terms making a finite contribution in an ideal conductor were omitted; the reason was that the corresponding terms are small. However, the substantial advances made in resent years in measuring noise and in preparing new mesoscopic conductors hold forth the hope that either it will be possible to measure even weaker noise in existing structures or that conductors with a very low Fermi energy and high mobility, where the effect is large, will become available.

As about observing the charge fluctuations, corresponding to such small terms in current fluctuations in ideal conductor, situation is yet more promising. As we showed in Expr.12 (see also [25]), these fluctuations are not small, and can be detected for example in "Which-Path Detector" (WPD) setup [28], provided the relevant length of the part of the wire, in which fluctuations are probed by WPD, is smaller or comparable to the effective Fermi wave-length.

I thank D. C. Glattli, M. Reznikov, D. Prober, and especially H. Bouchiat for helpful and stimulating discussions.

REFERENCES

[1] G.B. Lesovik, JETP Lett. **49** , 592 (1989).

[2] B. Yurke, G.P. Kochanski, Phys. Rev. B. **41**, 8184 (1990).

[3] M. Buttiker, Phys. Rev. Lett.**65**, 2901 (1990).

[4] Th. Martin, R. Landauer, Phys. Rev. B. **45**, 1742 (1992).

[5] I. O. Kulik, A. N. Omel'yanchuk, Sov. J.Low Temp.Phys.**10**158 (1984).

[6] V.A. Khlus, Sov. Phys. JETP **66**, 1243 (1987).

[7] M. Reznikov et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 3340 (1995).

[8] A. Kumar et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 2778 (1996).

[9] G.B. Lesovik, A.H. MacDonald, 1993, unpublished, see remark at Ref. 14 ;C.L. Kane, M.P.A. Fisher , Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 724 (1994).

[10] L. Saminadayar et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 2526 (1997).

[11] de-Picciotto et al., Nature **389**, 162 (1997).

[12] W. Schottky, Ann. Phys. (Leipzig) **57**, 16432 (1918).

[13] G. B. Lesovik, L. Levitov, JETP Lett.,**58**, 230 (1993).

[14] G. B. Lesovik, R. Loosen, Z. Phys. **B 91**, 531 (1993).

[15] L.V. Keldysh, Sov. Phys. JETP **20**, 1018 (1965).

[16] R. Landauer, IBM J. Res. Dev.**1**, 223 (1957); Phil. Mag., **21**, 863 (1970); P. W. Anderson, D. J. Thouless, E. Abrahams, D.S. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B. **22**, 3519 (1980); D. S. Fisher, P. A. Lee, Phys. Rev. B. **23**, 6851 (1981); M. Buttiker, Phys. Rev. Lett. **57**, 1761 (1986); Y. Imry, in: "Directions in Condensed Matter Physics", G. Grinstein and G. Mazenko, Eds., World Scientific Press, Singapore, 1986, p. 101.

[17] Y. B. Levinson, Sov. Phys. JETP, **68**,1257, (1989).

[18] D. B. Chklovskii et al., Phys. Rev. B. **46**, 4026 (1993).

[19] S.-R. Eric Yang, Solid State Commun. **81**, 375 (1992).

[20] G. B. Lesovik, L. Levitov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 538 (1994).

[21] C. de C. Chamon et al., Phys. Rev. B. **53**, 4033 (1996).

[22] R. J. Schoelkopf et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 3370 (1997).

[23] R. J. Schoelkopf et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2437 (1998).

[24] G. B. Lesovik, R. Loosen, JETP Lett. **65**, 295 (1997).

[25] Y. Levinson, cond-mat/9907055 (1999)

[26] Rodolphe Guyon, Thierry Martin, Gordey B. Lesovik, Tunable decoherence in the vicinity of a normal metal-superconducting junction, cond-mat/0011244, Journal-ref: Phys. Rev. B 64, 035315 (2001).

[27] H. Lee, L. S. Levitov, Phys. Rev. B **53**, 7383 (1996).

[28] E. Buks *et al* Nature **391**, 871 (1998).