Linear M agnetic R esponse of D isordered M etallic R ings: Large C ontribution from Forward Scattering Interactions

Long Phi Chau and Peter Kopietz
Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Frankfürt,
Robert-Mayer-Strasse 8, 60054 Frankfürt, Germany
(Dated: February 12, 2004)

We calculate the electron-electron interactions involving vanishing momentum transfer (forward scattering) on the orbital linear magnetic response of disordered metal rings pierced by a magnetic ux. Using the bulk value of the Landau parameter F_0 for copper, we not that in the experiment by Levy et al. [Phys. Rev. Lett. 64, 2074 (1990)] the forward scattering contribution to the linear magnetic response is larger than the corresponding contribution from large momentum transfers considered by Ambegaokar and Eckem [Phys. Rev. Lett. 65, 381 (1990)]. However, outside the regime of validity of linear response and to institution from large momentum transfers.

PACS num bers: 73.23 Ra, 74.20 Fg

I. INTRODUCTION

M ore than a decade ago the measurement by Levy et al.¹ of persistent currents in mesoscopic normalmetal rings pierced by an Aharonov-Bohm ux has triggered a lot of theoretical activity^{2,3}. Yet, up until now a truely convincing and generally accepted theoretical explanation of the surprisingly large persistent currents observed in Ref. and in subsequent experiments 4,5 has not been found. It has become clear, however, that this e ect cannot be explained within a model of non-interacting electrons. Ambegaokar and Eckem $(AE)^6$ were the rst to exam ine the e ect of electron-electron interactions on m esoscopic persistent currents: they realized that, to rst order in the screened C oulom b-interaction, the dom inant contribution to the disorder averaged persistent current can be obtained from the two diagrams shown in Fig. 1, representing a special correction $_{AE}$ () to the disorder averaged therm odynam ic potential which depends strongly on the Aharonov-Bohm ux . Here the overline denotes averaging over the disorder. G iven the grand canonical potential (), the corresponding persistent current I () can be obtained from the therm odynam ic

$$I() = e^{\frac{\theta}{\theta}}()$$
 : (1)

In a bulk metal at high densities the bare Coulombinteraction V_0 (q) = $4~e^2$ =q² is strongly screened. A simple way to take the screening into account diagram matically is the random-phase approximation (RPA). Following this procedure, AE approximated the elective interaction (in the imaginary frequency formalism) as follows

$$\overline{V}_{RPA} (q;i!) = \frac{V_0 (q)}{1 + \frac{1}{0} (q;i!) V_0 (q)} :$$
 (2)

Form om entum transfers jqjsm all com pared w ith the inverse elastic m ean free path v , and for frequency transfers j! j sm all com pared w ith the inverse elastic lifetim e




FIG. 1: Feynm an diagram s representing the ux-dependent part of the grand canonical potential to rst order in the screened interaction. (a) Hartree diagram; (b) Fock diagram. Solid arrows represent non-interacting disorder averaged G reen functions and thick wavy lines represent the elective density-density interaction. The Cooperon (shaded symbol) is defined in Fig. 2.

FIG. 2: D iagram m atic de nitions of the Cooperon (C) and the Diuson (D). A dashed line represents the covariance of the impurity potential.

1 the disorder averaged polarization is given by

where D₀ is the di usion coe cient and $_0$ is the average density of states at the Fermi energy (per spin) in the

absence of interactions. Note that $_0$ = ($_0$ V) 1 , where V is the volume of the system and $_0$ is the average level spacing (per spin) at the Ferm ienergy. It turns out that both diagrams in Fig. 1 are dominated by momentum transfers of the order of the Ferm imomentum k_F , which for a metallic system is large compared with 1 . Eqs. (2) and (3) are therefore not suitable for a quantitatively accurate calculation of persistent currents. To make some progress analytically, AE estimated the contribution from the diagrams in Fig. 1 by replacing the elective interaction by a constant

$$\overline{V}_{RPA}$$
 (k k^0 ; i!) ! $h\overline{V}_{RPA}$ (k_F k_F^0 ; i0) i \overline{V} ; (4)

where h:::i denotes the Ferm i surface average over k_F and $k_F^{\,0}$. For simplicity, it is assumed that the ring is quasi one-dimensional, with transverse thickness $L_{\,?}$ in the range $k_F^{\,\,1}$ $L_{\,?}$ ' $L_{\,,}$ where L is the circum ference of the ring. Then di usive motion is only possible along the circum ference. At temperature T = 0 the resulting average persistent current can be written as 6

$$\overline{\mathbf{I}}^{AE}$$
 () = \mathbf{I}_{k}^{AE} sin (4 k = 0); (5)

where $_0$ = hc=e is the ux quantum 7 and the Fourier coe cients of the current are

$$I_{k}^{AE} = \frac{c}{0} \frac{16}{k^{2}} E_{c} e^{k^{p}} [1 + k^{p}] :$$
 (6)

Here E $_{\rm C}$ = $^{\rm ND}_{0}$ =L 2 is the Thouless energy and = =E $_{\rm C}$ 1, where at zero temperature = $_{0}$ = is the cuto energy that regularizes the singularity in the Cooperon in a nite system 8 , see Eqs. (14) and (20) below. The coupling constant $_{\rm C}$ = $_{0}$ V can be identied with the dimensionless elective interaction in the Cooper channel to rst order in perturbation theory. A E estimated $_{\rm C}$ 0:3, assuming that the validity of the RPA can be extended to momentum transfers of the order of $k_{\rm F}$. However, higher order ladder diagrams in the Cooper channel strongly reduce the elective interaction, so that $_{\rm C}$ 0:06 is a more realistic estimate for the Cu-rings in the experiment 1 .

In real space Eq. (4) amounts to replacing the electronelectron interaction by a local electron density-density interaction,

$$\overline{V}_{e}$$
 (r r)! \overline{V} (r r): (7)

M ore precisely, this replacement means that for distances jr r^0j larger than ', the interaction is electively local. In a recent letter Schechter, O reg, Im ry, and Levinson pointed out that a dierent type of elective interaction can possibly lead to a much larger persistent current. Specifically, they used the BCS model to calculate the leading interaction correction to the orbital linear magnetic response and found $r^{7,10}$

$$\frac{\partial \overline{\mathbf{I}}^{BCS}}{\partial \mathbf{I}} = \frac{\mathbf{C}}{2} 32 \quad _{BCS} \mathbf{E}_{c} \ln \quad \frac{\mathbf{E}_{co}}{0} \quad ; \tag{8}$$

where $_{BCS}$ < 0 is the attractive dimensionless interaction in the BCS model, and the coherence energy E $_{co}$ is the smaller energy of $\sim=$ and the D ebye energy \sim ! $_{D}$. Eq. (8) should be compared with the corresponding result for the local interaction model used by AE, which implies according to Eqs. (5) and (6),

$$\frac{e^{\overline{L}^{A}E}}{e} = \frac{c}{2}32 \quad cE_{c} \ln \quad \frac{E_{c}}{0} \quad ; \tag{9}$$

where we have used = $_0$ = and retained only the leading logarithm is order. Note that the logarithm is due to the slow decay (/ k 1) of the Fourier coe – cients 4 k I $_{\rm k\,p}^{\rm A\,E}$ = $_0$ of @ I $_{\rm a\,E}^{\rm A\,E}$ =0, so that all coe cients with k . 1= contribute to the linear response. For E $_{\rm co}$ E $_{\rm c}$ the linearm agnetic response in the B C S m odel is param etrically larger than the linear response in the local interaction m odel. Whether or not this remains true beyond the linear response has not been clarified. Note also that in the B C S m odel the linear magnetic response is diam agnetic because the elective interaction is attractive ($_{\rm B\,C\,S}$ <0), whereas the linear response in the local interaction model is param agnetic, corresponding to a repulsive elective interaction ($_{\rm c}$ >0).

II. M AGNETIC RESPONSE DUE TO FORW ARD SCATTERING

An interesting observation made by the authors of Ref. is that an e ective interaction di erent from the local interaction used by AE can lead to a much larger persistent current, at least for su ciently small ux , where it is allowed to calculate the current from the linear response. Given the rather crude approximations in the m icroscopic derivation of the local interaction m odel, it seem sworth while to explore the magnetic response for other types of e ective interactions. A possibility which so far has not been thoroughly analyzed is an interaction which is dominated by smallmomentum transfers. Note that the assumption that only forward scattering processes (corresponding to vanishing momentum transfer) have to be taken into account for a consistent description of the low-energy and long-wavelength properties of norm alm etals lies at the heart of the Landau's Ferm i liquid theory. The Landau model is in a sense the opposite extrem e of the local interaction m odel, because the e ective interaction in the Landau model is proportional to a K ronecker-delta in m om entum space,

$$\overline{V}_{e}$$
 (q;i!)! q;0f₀; (10)

where the Landau param eter f_0 can be determ ined from experiments. In fact, the dimensionless Landau parameter 11 F_0 2 $_0$ f_0 can be written as $F_0 = \frac{B}{B_0} \frac{m}{m_0}$ 1, where B is the bulk modulus, m is the excitive mass, and B $_0$ and m $_0$ are the corresponding quantities in the absence of interactions. Inserting the known bulk values




FIG. 3: Feynm an diagram s that dom inate the ux-dependent part of the grand canonical potential if the e ective interaction involves only momentum transfers smaller than the inverse elastic mean free path, j_1j . ' 1 . For vanishing momentum transfer the Hartree diagram (a) dom inates the linear magnetic response, whereas outside the regime of validity of linear response the sum of the three Fock diagrams (b) { (d) has the same order of magnitude as the Hartree diagram (a). Note that the Diuson (shaded box, see Fig. 2) renormalizes only the density vertex in the Fock diagrams; the interaction in the Hartree diagram does not transfer any energy and hence cannot be renormalized by singular Diuson corrections.

for $C\,u^{12}$, m =m 1:3 and B =B₀ 2:1, we nd F₀ 1:7, which is a factor of 30 larger than the corresponding estimate $_{C}$ 0:06 in the local interaction model. Note that in real space Eq. (10) corresponds to a constant effective interaction, proportional to the inverse volume of the system

$$\overline{V}_{e}$$
 (r r^{0})! $\frac{f_{0}}{V}$: (11)

Given an elective interaction of the form (10), the dominant ux-dependent contributions to the average potential () to rst order in the interaction are shown in Fig. 3. The Fock diagrams (b) ((d) have been discussed previously in Refs. 13,14 ; as rst pointed out by Beal-M onod and M ontam baux 13 , to leading order in the smallparameter ($k_{\rm F}$ ') 1 , the three Fock diagrams in Fig. 3 (b) ((d) cancel, so that a direct evaluation of the sum of these diagrams is rathered cult. To calculate the leading contribution of these diagrams, we note that the fermion loops in Fig. 3 (b) ((d) can be identied with contributions to the disorder averaged polarization, which for general frequencies and small wavevectors can be written as 15

$$- {0 (q;i!) = 2 0 \frac{D (i!)q^2}{D (i!)q^2 + j! j};}$$
 (12)

where D (i!) is a generalized frequency-dependent D i usion coe cient. The crucial observation is now that the sum of the three Fock diagrams in Fig. 3 (b) { (d) corresponds to the usual weak localization correction to the average conductance 14 ,

$$D(i!)$$
 $D_0[1 + q_{W, T}(i!)];$ (13)

w here

$$g_{W L}(i!) = \frac{2_0}{q} X \frac{1}{\sim D_0 q^2 + j! j+} :$$
 (14)

E sæntially we have used the equation of continuity to replace the charge vertices in Fig. 3 by current vertices, which cannot be renormalized by singular di usion corrections. The fact that a gauge transformation replacing charge vertices by current vertices can be used to avoid the explicit calculation of vertex corrections has also been employed in Ref. 6 to calculate the zero bias anomaly in the tunneling density of states of two-dimensional disordered electrons interacting with Coulomb forces.

The evaluation of the contribution of the three Fock diagram s in Fig. 3 to the persistent current is now straightforward. Note that for a thin ring with L_2 'L the q-sum mation is one-dimensional, with quantized wavevectors 2 (n + 2 = $_0$)=L, n = 0; 1; 2;::. Then we obtain for the k-th Fourier component of the average current due to the Fock diagram s (b) { (d) in Fig. 3 for the Landau model 4 ,

$$I_k^{L;Fock} / k^{\frac{1}{V}} \frac{f_0}{V}$$
: (15)

Due to the extra factor of inverse volume, this contribution is, for experimentally relevant parameters¹, negligible compared with corresponding result in the local interaction model given in Eq. (6).

The Hartree diagram in the Landau model is more interesting. The fact that the diagram with two Cooperons shown in Fig. 3 (a) dominates the persistent current due to electron-electron interactions with momentum transfers jqj. ' has already been pointed out in Ref. 17. A similar diagram with two Cooperons (but without interaction line) dominates the uctuations of the number of energy levels in a xed energy window centered at the Fermienergy 18. Using the approximate relation

$$I_{N} () = \frac{C}{2} _{0} \frac{(0 (N)^{2})}{(0)}$$
 (16)

between the persistent current I_N () at constant particle number and the uctuation (N) of the particle number at constant chemical potential , several authors have realized 19,20,21 that without interactions the two-Cooperon diagram determines the average persistent current in a canonical ensemble. Note that the Hartree diagram in Fig. 3 (a) does not contain any vertex corrections analogous to the diusion corrections of the vertices in the Fock diagrams (b) { (d). This is due to the fact that the interaction line in the Hartree process does not transfer any energy. Hence, the two G reen functions attached to the vertex of a Hartree interaction are either both retarded or both advanced, so that it is in possible to attach a singular D i uson to the vertex.

For the Landau model the Hartree diagram in Fig. 3 (a) yields at nite temperature T the following correction

to the disorder averaged grand canonical potential,

$$\begin{array}{l} -\text{L}_{;\text{H artree}}(\) \ = \ \frac{f_0}{2\text{V}} \overset{X}{4} \quad \text{T}^2 \quad & \text{X} \\ & \text{T}^2 \quad & \text{(} \quad \overset{\textbf{L}}{n} \overset{\textbf{L}}{n} \circ \text{)} \\ & \frac{0}{2} \overset{\sim}{} \quad & \overset{2}{\sim} \quad & \overset{\sim}{\sim} \quad & \overset{2}{\sim} \\ & \frac{0}{2} \overset{\sim}{} \quad & \overset{\sim}{\sim} \quad & \overset{2}{\sim} \\ & \text{X} \quad & \overset{\sim}{\left[\overline{G}_0 \left(k; i \overset{\textbf{L}}{L}_n\right)\right]^2 \overline{G}_0 \left(\quad k + q; i \overset{\textbf{L}}{L}_n \circ \right)} \\ & \overset{X^k}{\left[\overline{G}_0 \left(k^0; i \overset{\textbf{L}}{L}_n \circ \right)\right]^2 \overline{G}_0 \left(\quad k^0 + q; i \overset{\textbf{L}}{L}_n \circ \right)} : \end{array} \tag{17}$$

Here = ${}^{\checkmark}V_F$ is the elastic lifetime, ${}^{\downarrow}V_n = 2$ $(n + \frac{1}{2})T$ are ferm ionic M atsubara frequencies, and

$$\overline{G}_{0}(k;i\rlap{\rlap{\rlap{\rlap{\rlap{\rlap{\rlap{\rlap{\rlap{}}}}}}}}_{n}) = \frac{1}{i\rlap{\rlap{\rlap{\rlap{\rlap{\rlap{\rlap{\rlap{}}}}}}}}_{n} \frac{^{-2}k^{2}}{2m} + + i\frac{^{-}}{2} sign\rlap{\rlap{\rlap{\rlap{\rlap{\rlap{\rlap{}}}}}}}_{n}}$$
(18)

is the disorder averaged non-interacting M atsubara G reen function. Since the Cooperons (i.e. the second line) in Eq. (17) are only singular for jqj. '¹, and because the k-and k⁰-sum s are dom inated by m om enta of the order of the Ferm im om entum, we m ay approxim ate \overline{G}_0 (k+q;i \cdot i \cdot n) \overline{G}_0 (k;i \cdot n) and \overline{G}_0 (k⁰+q;i \cdot n) \overline{G}_0 (k°;i \cdot n) in Eq. (17). The product of the last two lines of Eq. (17) gives then rise to a factor of [(2 = $_0$) (=~ \cdot)² \cdot ², so that we obtain

-L;Hartree () =
$$\frac{f_0}{2V}P$$
 (); (19)

with the dim ensionless coe cient

$$P() = \frac{4T}{100} X X X \frac{!_{m}}{[-D_{0}q^{2} + !_{m} +]^{2}}; (20)$$

where $!_m=2\,$ m T are bosonic M atsubara frequencies. A ssum ing again a thin ring with L? L, we nd in the lim it T ! 0 for the Fourier components of the persistent current,

$$I_{k}^{\text{L;H artree}} = \frac{16}{0} \frac{c}{0} \frac{f_{0}}{2V} e^{k^{p}} = \frac{c}{0} 8F_{0} \frac{0}{0} e^{k^{p}} : (21)$$

C om paring this expression with the corresponding result (6) of the local interaction model, we see that in the Landau model the Fourier components $I_k^{\rm L;H\;artree}$ are independent of k as long as k . 1= $^{\rm L}$. Therefore the linear magnetic response is determined by all Fourier components up to k . $\overline{E}_{c}=$,

$$\frac{\partial \overline{\mathbf{I}}^{L;H \text{ artree}}}{\partial \mathbf{I}} = \frac{4}{0} \sum_{k=1}^{X^{k}} k \mathbf{I}_{k}^{L;H \text{ artree}}$$

$$\frac{\mathbf{C}}{0} 16 \quad \mathbf{F}_{0} \mathbf{E}_{c}; \qquad (22)$$

where we have assumed that $= = E_c$ 1, so that

$$x^{\frac{1}{2}} k e^{k^{p}} = \frac{e^{p}}{[1 e^{p}]^{2}} \frac{1}{[2 e^{p}]^{2}} (23)$$

Note that the smallenergy scale $_0$ of Eq. (21) has disappeared on the right-hand side of Eq. (22), and is replaced by the much larger Thouless energy Ec. Due to the faster decay of the Fourier components (15) of the Fock contribution in the Landau model, the linear response due to the Fock diagrams shown in Fig. 3 (b) { (d) is a factor of =E c sm aller than the corresponding H artree contribution. Interestingly, the anom alously large linearm agnetic response in the BCS model given in Eq. (8) is also dom inated by the Hartree process10. Thus, the importance of Hartree interactions for persistent currents is some extent independent of a speci c model for the interaction. For the Cu-rings used in the experiment we estimate 1:7, $_{\rm c}$ 0:06 and $E_{\rm c}$ = $_{\rm 0}$ 25; with these values the linear magnetic response due to forward scattering is m ore than four times larger than the linear response in the local interaction model considered by AE^6 . To take both contributions into account one should param eterize the totale ective interaction as

$$\overline{V}_{e}$$
 $(r \quad r^{0}) = \overline{V} \quad (r \quad r^{0}) + \frac{f_{0}}{V} ;$ (24)

which in momentum space amounts to

$$\overline{V}_{e}$$
 (q) = \overline{V} for q = 0
 f_{0} for q \(\frac{\phi}{6}\) (25)

U sing the estimate for <u>bulk</u> Cu given above, $F_0 = 2_0 f_0 = 1.7$ and $c = _0 \overline{V} = 0.06$, we not $f_0 = \overline{V} = 14$, which supports our assumption that there is indeed a strong enhancement of the elective interaction in the forward scattering channel.

III. CONCLUSIONS

In sum mary, we have shown that a forward scattering excess interaction, involving a vanishing momentum transfer, yields the dom inant contribution to the linear m agnetic response of m esoscopic m etal rings for experim entally relevant param eters. On the other hand, outside the linear response regime the persistent current is dominated by the term \overline{V} involving large momentum transfers, at least if we use the bulk estimates for V and F_0 for Cu. However, for a mesoscopic disordered Cu-ring it is not obvious that the bulk estim ates are reliable. Note also that in the bulk the norm al Ferm i liquid is stable as long as $F_0 > 1$, so that for $0 > F_0 >$ the linear magnetic response in the normal state can be diam agnetic, in spite of the fact that the e ective coupling c in the Cooper channel is positive. Moreover, in the vicinity of an s-wave Pomeranchuk instability 22,23, where $F_0 < 0$ and $jl + F_0 j$ 1, one should replace F_0 by $F_0 = (1 + F_0)$. In this case we predict a strongly enhanced diam agnetic linear response. In fact, the forward scattering channel might then dominate the persistent current even beyond the linear order in the ux . To

clarify this point, a better m icroscopic theory of the effective electron-electron interaction in m esoscopic disordered m etals is necessary. In particular, a m icroscopic theory should properly treat the problem of screening in a nite system and incorporate the breakdown of Ferm i

liquid theory in quasione-dimensional disordered metals at su ciently low temperatures 24 .

W e thank M . Schechter for his clarifying rem arks concerning Ref. 10 and for his comments on this manuscript.

¹ L.P.Levy, G.Dolan, J.Dunsmuir, and H.Bouchiat, Phys. Rev.Lett. 64, 2074 (1990).

Y. Im ry, Introduction to M esoscopic Physics (O xford University Press, O xford, 1997).

³ U.Eckern and P.Schwab, J.Low Temp. Phys. 126, 1291 (2002).

⁴ P.M ohanty, Ann. Physik (Leipzig) 8, 549 (1999).

⁵ E.M.Q. Jariwala, P.M ohanty, M.B.K etchen, and R.A. Webb, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 1594 (2001).

⁶ V. Ambegaokar and U. Eckem, Phys. Rev. Lett. 65, 381 (1990).

We prefer to express the response in terms of the normal ux quantum 0 = hc=e, whereas 0 = hc=2e in Ref. is the superconducting ux quantum. This is the reason why the numerical prefactor in our Eq. (8) is 32, while the corresponding prefactor in Eq. (1) of Ref. is 8.

⁸ A. Volker and P. Kopietz, Mod. Phys. Lett. B 10, 1397 (1996).

⁹ U.Eckem, Z.Phys.B 82,393 (1991).

M . Schechter, Y . O reg, Y . Im ry, and Y . Levinson, Phys. Rev. Lett. 90, 026805 (2003).

 $^{^{11}}$ N ote that we de ne $_{0}$ to be the density of states per spin, so that F $_{0}$ = 2 $_{0}\,f_{0}$ agrees with the usual de nition of the dim ensionless Landau param eter.

¹² N.W. A shcroft and N.D. Merm in, Solid State Physics,

⁽Holt-Saunders, Philadelphia, 1976).

¹³ M .T .Beal-M onod and G .M ontam baux, Phys. Rev. B 46, 7182 (1992).

¹⁴ P.Kopietz and A.Volker, Phys. Lett. A 244, 569 (1998).

¹⁵ D. Vollhardt and P.W ol e, Phys. Rev. B 22, 4666 (1980).

¹⁶ P.Kopietz, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 2120 (1998).

¹⁷ P.Kopietz, Phys.Rev.Lett.70, 3123 (1993); erratum: 71, 306 (1993).

B.L.A Itshuler and B.I. Shklovskii, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 91,220 (1986) [Sov. Phys. JETP 64,127 (1986)].

 $^{^{\}rm 19}$ A .Schm id, Phys. Rev. Lett. 66, 80 (1991).

²⁰ F. von Oppen and E.K.Riedel, Phys.Rev.Lett. 66, 84 (1991).

²¹ B.L.Altshuler, Y.Gefen, and Y.Imry, Phys.Rev.Lett. 66,88 (1991).

²² I. J. Pom eranchuk, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 35, 524 (1958) [Sov. Phys. JETP 8, 361 (1958)].

G. M urthy and R. Shankar, Phys. Rev. Lett. 90, 066801 (2003); D. Herm an, H. M athur, and G. M urthy, Phys. Rev. B 69, 041301 (2004); G. M urthy, R. Shankar, D. Herm an, and H. M athur, ibid. 69, 075321 (2004).

B. L. Altshuler and A. G. Aronov, in Electron-Electron Interactions in Disordered Systems, edited by A. L. Efros and M. Pollak, (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1985).