Quantum uctuations and glassy behavior of electrons near m etal-insulator transitions

V.Dobrosavljevic

Department of Physics and National High Magnetic Field Laboratory, Florida State University, Tallahasse, FL 32306, USA

ABSTRACT

G lassy behavior is a generic feature of electrons close to disorder-driven m etal-insulator transitions. D eep in the insulating phase, electrons are tightly bound to impurities, and thus classical m odels for electron glasses have long been used. As the m etallic phase is approached, quantum uctuations become m ore important, as they control the electronic m obility. In this paper we review recent work that used extended dynam ical m ean-eld approaches to discuss the in uence of such quantum uctuations on the glassy behavior of electrons, and exam ine how the stability of the glassy phase is a ected by the Anderson and the M ott m echanism s of localization.

K eyw ords: E lectron glass, quantum uctuations, localization

1.GLASSY BEHAVIOR AS A PRECURSOR TO THE METAL-INSULATOR TRANSITION

Understanding the metal-insulator transition (M IT) poses one of the most basic questions of condensed matter physics. It has been been a topic of much controversy and debate starting from early ideas of M ott,¹ and Anderson,² but the problem remains far from being resolved. Quite generally, when a system is neither a good metal nor a good insulator, both the localized and the itinerant aspects of the problem are important. In this intermediate regime, several competing processes can be simultaneously present. As a result, the system cannot



Figure 1. Three basic routes to localization

\decide" whether to be a m etal or an insulator until a very low temperature T is reached, below which a m ore conventional description applies. This situation is typical of systems close to a quantum critical point,³ which describes a zero temperature second order phase transition between two distinct states of m atter. Understanding the nature of low energy excitations in the interm ediate regime between a m etal and an insulator is of crucial importance for the progress in m aterial science.

Further author inform ation: E-m ail: vlad@ m agnet.fsu.edu

The prim ary reason for theoretical di culties is related to the fact that both the M ott and the Anderson transition nd them selves in regim es where traditional, perturbative approaches⁴ cannot be straightforwardly applied. To make the problem even more di cult, simple estimates¹ are su cient to appreciate that in many situations the e ects of interactions and disorder are of comparable magnitude and thus both should be simultaneously considered. So far, very few approaches have attempted to simultaneously incorporate these two basic routes to localization.

A nother aspect of disordered interacting electrons poses a fundam ental problem . Very generally, C oulom b repulsion favors a uniform electronic density, while disorder favors local density uctuations. When these two e ects are comparable in magnitude, one can expect many di erent low energy electronic con gurations, i.e. the emergence of m any m etastable states. Sim ilarly as in other \frustrated" system s with disorder, such as spin glasses, these processes can be expected to lead to glassy behavior of the electrons, and the associated anom alously slow relaxational dynam ics. Indeed, both theoretical 5^{6} and experimental 7^{11} work has found evidence of such behavior deep on the insulating side of the transition. How ever, at present very little is known as to the precise role of such processes in the critical region. Nevertheless, it is plausible that the glassy freezing of the electrons must be important, since the associated slow relaxation clearly will reduce the mobility of the electrons. From this point of view, the glassy freezing of electrons may be considered, in addition to the Anderson and the M ott m echanism, as a third fundam ental process associated with electron localization. Interest in understanding the glassy aspects of electron dynamics has experienced a genuine renaissance in the last few years, primarily due to experim ental advances. Em ergence of m any m etastable states, slow relaxation and incoherent transport have been observed in a number of strongly correlated electronic systems. These included transition metal oxides such as high T c m aterials, m anganites, and ruthenates. Sim ilar features have recently been reported in two-dimensional electron gases, and even three dimensional doped sem iconductors such as SiP.

2.EXTENDED DMFT APPROACHES FOR DISORDERED ELECTRONS

A num ber of experim ental and theoretical investigations have suggested that the conventional picture of disordered interacting electrons may be incomplete. Most remarkably, the characteristic \critical" behavior seen in many experiments covers a surprisingly broad range of temperatures and densities. This is more likely to reject an underlying \mean-eld" behavior of disordered interacting electrons than the asymptotic critical behavior described by an elective long-wavelength theory. Thus a simple mean-eld description is needed to provide the



F igure 2. In dynam ical mean-eld theory, the environment of a given site is represented by an elective medium, represented by its \cavity spectral function" $_{i}(!)$. In a disordered system, $_{i}(!)$ for dilerent sites can be very dilerent, relecting Anderson localization elects.

equivalent of a Van der W aals equation of state, for disordered interacting electrons. Such a theory has long been elusive, prim arily due to a lack of a simple order-parameter form ulation for this problem. Very recently, an alternative approach to the problem of disordered interacting electrons has been form ulated, based on dynam ical m ean-eld theory (DMFT) methods.¹² This form ulation is largely complem entary to the scaling approach, and has already resulting in several striking predictions.

The DM FT approach focuses on a single lattice site, but replaces¹² its environment by a self-consistently determ ined \e ective medium ", as shown in Fig. 2. For itinerant electrons, the environment cannot be represented by a static external edd, but instead must contain the information about the dynamics of an electron moving in or out of the given site. Such a description can be made precise by formally integrating out¹² all the degrees of freedom on other lattice sites. In presence of electron-electron interactions, the resulting local electric external has an arbitrarily complicated form. Within DM FT, the situation simplifies, and all the information about the environment is contained in the local single particle spectral function i (!). The calculation then reduces to solving an appropriate quantum in purity problem supplemented by an additional self-consistency condition that determines this \cavity function" i (!).

The precise form of the DMFT equations depends on the particular model of interacting electrons and/or the form of disorder, but most applications¹² to this date have focused on Hubbard and Anderson lattice models. The approach has been very successful in examining the vicinity of the M ott transition in clean systems in which it has met spectacular successes in elucidating various properties of several transition metal oxides,¹³ heavy ferm ion system s, and K ondo insulators.¹⁴

W hen appropriately generalized to disordered system s_r^{13} these m ethods are able to incorporate all the three basic mechanisms of electron localization. In particular, the DMFT approach is able to present a consistent picture for the glassy behavior of electrons, and discuss its emergence in the vicinity of metal-insulator transitions. In this paper we review recent results obtained in this fram ework, and discuss their relevance to several experimental system s.

3.SIM PLE MODEL OF AN ELECTRON GLASS

The interplay of the electron-electron interactions and disorder is particularly evident deep on the insulating side of the m etal-insulator transition (M IT). Here, both experim ental¹⁵ and theoretical studies¹⁶ have dem onstrated that they can lead to the form ation of a soft \C oulom b gap", a phenom enon that is believed to be related to the glassy behavior^{7(11,17} of the electrons. Such glassy freezing has long been suspected¹⁸ to be of in portance, but very recent work^{19,20} has suggested that it may even dom inate the M IT behavior in certain low carrier density system s. The classic work of E fros and Shklovskil¹⁶ has clari ed som e basic aspects of this behavior, but a num ber of key questions have rem ain unanswered.

As a simplest example²¹ displaying glassy behavior of electrons, we focus on a simple lattice model of spinless electrons with nearest neighbor repulsion V in presence of random site energies "_i and inter-site hopping t, as given by the H am iltonian

$$H = \sum_{\substack{\langle ij \rangle \\ \langle ij \rangle \\ (1)$$

This model can be solved²¹ in a properly de ned limit of large coordination number z_i^{12} where an extended dynam icalm ean-eld (DMF) formulation becomes exact. We concentrate on the situation where the disorder (or more generally frustration) is large enough to suppress any uniform ordering. We then rescale both the hopping elements and the interaction amplitudes as t_{ij} ! $t_{ij} = \overline{z}$; V_{ij} ! $V_{ij} = \overline{z}$. As we will see shortly, the required uctuations then survive even in the z ! 1 limit, allowing for the existence of the glassy phase. W ithin this model:

The universal form of the C oulom b gap^6 proves to be a direct consequence of glassy freezing.

The glass phase is identi ed through the em ergence of an extensive num ber of m etastable states, which in our form ulation is manifested as a replica symmetry breaking instability.²²

As a consequence of this ergodicity breaking² the zero-eld cooled compressibility is found to vanish at T = 0, suggesting the absence of screening¹⁶ in disordered insulators.

The quantum uctuations can melt this glass even at T = 0, but the relevant energy scale is set by the electronic mobility, and is therefore a nontrivial function of disorder.

We should stress that although this model allows to exam ine the interplay of glassy ordering and quantum uctuations due to itinerant electrons, it is too simple to describe the electron of Anderson localization. These electron electrons to lattices with nite coordination, and and will be discussed in the next section.

For simplicity, we focus on a Bethe lattice at half lling, and exam ine the z ! 1 limit. This strategy autom atically introduces the correct order parameters, and after standard manipulations²³ the problem reduces to a self-consistently de ned single site problem, as de ned by an the elective action of the form

$$S_{eff}(i) = \frac{X Z Z}{a^{0}} d^{0} [c_{i}^{ya}()((0) + \mathbf{u}_{i} + t^{2}G(0)]c_{i}^{a}(0)] + \frac{1}{2}V^{2} n_{i}^{a}(0) + \frac{1}{2}V^{2} X Z d^{0} d^{0} n_{i}^{a}(0)] + \frac{1}{2}V^{2} X d^{0} d^{0} n_{i}^{a}(0) q_{b} n_{i}^{b}(0):$$
(2)

Here, we have used functional integration over replicated G rassmann elds²³ c_i^a () that represent electrons on site i and replica index a, and the random site energies ", are distributed according to a given probability distribution P (",). The operators n_i^a () = (c_1^{Va} () c_1^a () 1=2) represent the density uctuations from half lling. The order parameters G (0), (0) and q_{ab} satisfy the following set of self-consistency conditions

G (

Ζ

⁰) =
$$d^{\mathbf{u}}_{i}P(\mathbf{u}_{i}) < c_{i}^{ya}(\mathbf{v}_{i}) < e_{ff}^{a};$$
 (3)

$$q_{ab} = d''_{1}P(''_{1}) < r_{1}^{ya}() r_{1}^{b}(') >_{eff} :$$
 (5)

3.1.0 rder param eters

In these equations, the averages are taken with respect to the electron of Eq. (2). Physically, the hybridization function" t^2G (⁰) represents the single-particle electronic spectrum of the environment, as seen by an electron on site i. In particular, its imaginary part at zero frequency can be interpreted²⁴ as the inverse lifetime of the local electron, and as such remains nite as long as the system is metallic. We recall²³ that for V = 0 these equations reduce to the familiar CPA description of disordered electrons, which is exact for z = 1. The second quantity (⁰) represents an (interaction-induced) mode-coupling term that relects the retarded response of the density uctuations of the environment. Note that very similar objects appear in the well-known mode-coupling theories of the glass transition in dense liquids.²⁵ Finally the quantity q_{ab} (a \in b) is nothing but the familiar Edwards-Anderson order parameter q_{EA} . Its nonzero value indicates that the time averaged electronic density is spatially non-uniform.

3.2. Equivalent In nite Range model

From a technical point of view, a RSB analysis is typically carried out by focusing on a free energy expressed as a functional of the order parameters. In our B ethe lattice approach, one directly obtains the self-consistency conditions form appropriate recursion relations,²³ without invoking a free energy functional. However, we have found it useful to m ap our z = 1 model to another in nite range model, which has exactly the same set of order parameters and self-consistency conditions, but for which an appropriate free energy functional can easily be determined. The relevant model is still given Eq. (1), but this time with random hopping elements t_{ij} and random nearest-neighbor interaction V_{ij} , having zero mean and variance t^2 , and V^2 , respectively. For this model, standard manipulations²³ result in the following free energy functional

$$F[G;;q_{ab}] = \frac{1}{2} X Z d d^{0} t^{2}G^{2}(;^{0}) + V^{2}(;^{0}) \frac{1}{2} X (V)^{2} q_{ab}^{2}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} Z Z d d^{0} t^{2}G^{2}(;^{0}) + V^{2}(;^{0}) \frac{1}{2} X (V)^{2} q_{ab}^{2}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} X (V)^{2} q_{ab}^{2}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} X (V)^{2} q_{ab}^{2} + \frac{1}{2} X (V)^{2} q_{ab}^{2}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} X (V)^{2} q_{ab}^{2} + \frac{1}{2} X (V)^{2} q_{ab}^{2}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} X (V)^{2} q_{ab}^{2} + \frac{1}{2} X (V)^{2} + \frac{1}{2} X ($$

with S_{eff} (i) given by Eq. (2). The self-consistency conditions, Eqs. (4-6) then follow from

$$0 = F = G(;^{0}); 0 = F = (;^{0}); 0 = F = g_{b};$$
(7)

W e stress that Eqs. (3-5) have been derived for the model with uniform hopping elements t_{ij} and interaction amplitudes V_{ij} , in the z ! 1 limit, but the same equations hold for an in nite range model where these parameters are random variables.

3.3. The glass transition

In our electronic model, the random site energies " $_{i}$ play a role of static random elds. As a result, in presence of disorder, the Edwards-Anderson parameter q_{EA} remains nonzero for any temperature, and thus cannot serve as an order parameter. To identify the glass transition, we search for a replica sym metry breaking (RSB) instability, following standard methods.^{26,27} We de ne $q_{bb} = q_{ab}$ q, and expand the free energy functional of Eq. (6) around the RS solution. The resulting quadratic form (Hessian matrix) has the matrix elements given by

$$\frac{\ell^{2}F}{\ell q_{ab}\ell q_{bd}} = (V)^{2} a_{c bd} \qquad V^{4} \qquad d_{1}d_{2}d_{3}d_{4} [< n_{a}(1) n_{b}(2) n_{c}(3) n_{d}(4) >_{RS} 0 0 0 0 < n_{a}(1) n_{b}(2) >_{RS} < n_{c}(3) n_{d}(4) >_{RS}]; \qquad (8)$$

where the expectation values are calculated in the RS solution. Using standard manipulations,²⁶ and after lengthy algebra, we nally arrive at the desired RSB stability criterion that takes the form

$$1 = V^{2} \left(\int_{loc} (\mathbf{u}_{i})^{2} \int_{dis}^{i} (\mathbf{u}_{i})^{2} \right)^{2}$$
(9)

Here, $[:::]_{dis}$ indicates the average over disorder, and loc ("i) is the local compressibility, that can be expressed as z

$$_{\text{loc}}(\mathbf{"}_{i}) = \frac{\underline{\theta}}{\underline{\theta} \cdot \mathbf{"}_{i}} \frac{1}{2} \qquad d < \underline{n}(\cdot) > ;$$
(10)

and which is evaluated by carrying out quantum averages for a xed realization of disorder. The relevant expectation values have to be carried with respect to the full local e ective action S_{eff} (i) of Eq. (2), evaluated in the RS theory. In general, the required computations cannot be carried out in close form, prim arily due to the unknown \m em ory kernel" (⁰). However, as we will see, the algebra simplies in several limits, where explicit expressions can be obtained.

4.CLASSICAL ELECTRON GLASS

In the classical (t = 0) limit, the problem can easily be solved in close form. We rest focus on the replica symmetric (RS) solution, and set $q_{ab} = q$ for all replica pairs. The corresponding equation reads

$$q = \frac{1}{4} \int_{1}^{Z_{+1}} \frac{dx}{p} e^{x^{2}=2} \tanh^{2} \frac{1}{2} x \quad (V)^{2}q + (W)^{2} = i^{2}; \qquad (11)$$

where we have considered a Gaussian distribution of random site energies of variance W 2 . Note that the interactions introduce an elective, enhanced disorder strength

$$W_{eff} = \frac{p}{W^2 + V^2 q}; \qquad (12)$$

since the frozen-in density uctuations introduce an added component to the random potential seen by the electron. As expected, $q \in 0$ for any temperature when $W \in 0$. If the interaction strength is appreciable as compared to disorder, we thus expect the resistivity to display an appreciable increase at low temperatures. We emphasize that this mechanism is di erent from Anderson localization, which is going to be discussed in the next section, but which also gives rise to a resistivity increase at low temperatures.

Next, we exam ine the instability to glassy ordering. In the classical (t = 0) lim it Eq. (9) reduces to

$$1 = \frac{1}{16} (V)^{2} \int_{1}^{X+1} \frac{dx}{P} e^{x^{2}=2} \cosh^{4} \frac{1}{2} X W_{eff}(q) ; \qquad (13)$$

with W_{eff} (q) given by Eq.(12). The resulting RSB instability line separates a low temperature glassy phase from a high temperature \bad m etal" phase. At large disorder, these expensions simplify, and we nd

$$T_{G} = \frac{1}{6 2} \frac{V^{2}}{W}; W ! 1 :$$
 (14)

We conclude that T_G decreases at large disorder. This is to be expected, since in this limit the electrons drop in the lowest potential minima of the random potential. This de ness a unique ground state, suppressing the frustration associated with the glassy ordering, and thus reducing the glassy phase. It is important to note that for the well known de Almeida-Thouless (AT) line T_{RSB} decreases exponentially in the strong eld limit. In contrast, we nd that in our case, $T_G = 1$ =W decreases only slow ly in the strong disorder limit. This is important, since the glassy phase is expected to be most relevant for disorder strengths su cient to suppress uniform ordering. At the same time, glassy behavior will only be observable if the associated glass transition tem perature remains appreciable.

4.1. The glassy phase

To understand this behavior, we investigate the structure of the low-tem perature glass phase. Consider the single-particle density of states at T = 0, which in the classical limit can be expressed as

$$(";t=0) = \frac{1}{N} X (" \frac{n}{i});$$
(15)

where $\mathbf{n}_{i}^{R} = \mathbf{n}_{i}^{+} + \mathbf{v}_{ij}\mathbf{n}_{j}$ are the renorm alized site energies. In the therm odynam ic lim it, this quantity is nothing but the probability distribution $P_{R}(\mathbf{n}_{i}^{R})$. It is analogous to the \local eld distribution" in the spin-glass models, and can be easily shown to reduce to a simple G aussian distribution in the RS theory, establishing the absence of any gap for $T > T_{G}$. Obtaining explicit results from a replica calculation in the glass phase is more di cult, but useful insight can be achieved by using standard simulation methods^{28,29} on our equivalent in nite-range model; some typical results are shown in Fig. 1. We nd that as a result of glassy freezing, a pseudo-gap emerges in the single-particle density of states, rem iniscent of the C oulom b gap of E fros and Shklovskii (ES).¹⁶ The low energy form of this gap appears universal,

(")
$$C = V^{2}; C = I;$$
 (16)

independent of the disorder strength W, again in striking analogy with the predictions of ES. To establish this result, we have used stability arguments very similar to those developed for spin-glass (SG) models,²⁹ demonstrating that the form of Eq. (16) represents an exact upper bound for ("). For in nite-ranged SG models, as in our case, this bound appears to be saturated, leading to universal behavior. Such universality is often associated with a critical, self-organized state of the system. Recent work²⁹ nds strong numerical evidence of such criticality for SG models; we believe that the universal gap form in our case has the same origin. Furtherm ore, assuming that the universal form of Eq. (11) is obeyed immediately allows for an estimate of T_G (W). Using Eq. (16) to estimate the gap size for large disorder gives $T_G = V^2 = W$, in agreement with Eq. (14).



Figure 3. Single particle density of states in the classical (t = 0) lim it at T = 0, as a function of disorder strength. Results are shown from a simulation on N = 200 site system, for W = V = 0.5 (thin line) and W = V = 1.0 (full line). Note that the low energy form of the gap takes a universal form, independent of the disorder strength W. The dashed line follows Eq. (16).

The ergodicity breaking associated with the glassy freezing has in portant consequences for ourm odel. A gain, using the close similarity of our classical in nite range model to standard SG models,²² it is not dicult to see that the zero-eld cooled (ZFC) compressibility vanishes at T = 0, in contrast to the eld-cooled one, which remains nite. E seentially, if the chemical potential is modi ed after the system is cooled to T = 0, the system in mediately falls out of equilibrium and displays hysteretic behavior²⁹ with vanishing typical compressibility. If this behavior persists in nite dimensions and for more realistic C oulom b interactions, it could explain the absence of screening in disordered insulators.

4.2. A rbitrary lattices and nite coordination: m ean-eld glassy phase of the random - eld Ising m odel.

Simplest theories of glassy freezing²² are obtained by examining models with random inter-site interactions. In the case of disordered electronic systems, the interactions are not random, but glassiness still emerges due to frustration introduced by the competition of the interactions and disorder. As we have seen for the Bethe lattice,²¹ random interactions are generated by renormalization elects, so that standard DMFT approaches can still be used. However, one would like to develop systematic approaches for arbitrary lattices and in nite coordination. These issues already appear on the classical level, where our model reduces to the random – eld Ising model (RFM).³⁰ To investigate the glassy behavior of the RFM, we developed³¹ a systematic approach that can incorporate short-range ucuation corrections to the standard Bragg-W illiams theory, following the method of P lefka³² and G eorges et al.³³ This work has shown that:

C orrections to even the lowest nontrivial order in m ediately result in the appearance of a glassy phase for su ciently strong random ness.

This low -order treatment is su cient in the joined lim it of large coordination and strong disorder.

The structure of the resulting glassy phase is characterized by universal hysteresis and avalanche behavior emerging from the self-organized criticality of the ordered state.

5.QUANTUM MELTING OF THE ELECTRON GLASS

Next, we investigate how the glass transition temperature can be depressed by quantum uctuations introduced by inter-site electron tunneling. As in other quantum glass problems, quantum uctuations introduce dynamics in the problem, and the relevant self-consistency equations cannot be solve in closed form for general values of the parameters. In the following, we will see that in the limit of large random ness, an exact solution is possible.

5.1.Quantum phase diagram

The main source of di culty in general quantum glass problems relates to the existence of a self-consistently determined m em ory kernel" (⁰) in the local electrice action. By the same reasoning as in the clasical case, one can also ignore this term since this quantity is also bounded.



F igure 4. Phase diagram as a function of quantum hopping t, temperature T and disorder strength W . G lass transition temperature T_G decreases only slow ly (as 1=W) in the strong disorder limit. In contrast, the critical value of the hoping element t_G remains nite as W ! 1

The remaining action is that of noninteracting electrons in presence of a strong random potential. The resulting local compressibility then takes the form

$$_{loc}(") = \frac{Z_{+1}}{4} d! "(!) \cosh^{2}(\frac{1}{2} !):$$
(17)

Here, "(!) is the local density of states, which in the considered large z lim it is determined by the solution of the CPA equation $_7$

In the lim it W =t >> 1, it reduces to a narrow resonance of width = $t^2 P(0)$ $t^2 = W$

"(!)
$$\frac{1}{(! ")^2 + 2}$$
: (19)

The resulting expression for the quantum critical line in the large disorder lim it takes the form

$$t_{\rm G} (T = 0; W ! 1) = V = :$$
 (20)

At rst glance, this result is suprising, since it means that a nite value of the Ferm i energy is required to melt the electron glass at T = 0, even in the W ! 1 limit ! This is to be contrasted with the behavior of T_G in the classical limit, which according to Eq. (17) was found to decrease as 1=W for strong disorder. At st puzzling, the above result in fact has a simple physical meaning. Namely, the small resonance width (or \hybridization energy") t^2 =W can be interpreted^{2,24} as the characteristic energy scale for the electronic motion. As rst pointed by Anderson,² according to Ferm i's golden rule, the transition rate to a neighboring site is proportional to and not t, and thus becomes extrem ely small at large disorder. Thus the \size" of quantum uctuations, that replace the thermal uctuations at T = 0, is proportional to 1=W, and thus becomes very small in the large W limit. We can now easily understand the qualitative behavior shown in Eq. (24) by replacing T ! t^2 =W in Eq. (17). The leading W dependence cancels out, and we nd a nite value for t_G in the W ! 1 limit.

M ore generally, we can write an expression for the glass transition critical line in the large disorder limit, as a function of = 1=T and t in the scaling form

$$1 = (V=t)^{2} (t^{2}=W);$$
 (21)

with

$$(z) = \frac{1}{4} z^{2} \int_{1}^{2} dx \int_{1}^{2} dy \frac{1}{1 + (x - y)^{2}} \cosh^{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} z y\right)^{2} : \qquad (22)$$

At nite disorder an exact solution is not possible, but we can make analytical progress motivated by our discussion of the large W limit. Namely, one can imagine evaluating the required local compressibilities in Eq. (13) by a \weak coupling" expansion in powers of the interaction V. To leading order, this means evaluating the compressibilities at V = 0, an approximation which becomes exact for W large. Such an approximation can be tested for other spin glass problems. We have carried out the corresponding computations for the in nite range Ising spin glass model in a transverse eld, where the exact critical transverse eld is known from numerical studies. We can expect the leading approximation to underestimate the size of the glassy region, i.e. the critical eld, since the omitted \memory kernel" introduces long range correlations in time, which make the system more \classical". Indeed, we nd that the leading approximation underestimates the critical eld by only about 30%, whereas the next order correction makes an error of less than 5%. Encouraged by these arguments, we use this \weak-coupling" approximation for arbitrary disorder strength W. Again, the computation of the compressibility reduces to that of noninteracting electrons in a CPA form ulation; the resulting phase diagram is shown in Fig. 4.

5.2.Q uantum critical behavior of the electron glass

So far, we have seen how our extended DMFT equations can be simplified for large disorder, allowing an exact computation of the phase boundary in this limit. In our case, this quantum critical line separates a (non-glassy) Ferm i liquid phase, and a metallic glass phase which, as we will see, features non-Ferm i liquid behavior. If one is interested in details of dynam ics of the electrons near the quantum critical line, the above simplifications do not apply, and one is forced to self-consistently calculate the form of the "mem ory kernel" (local dynam ic compressibility) (0). Fortunately, this task can be carried out using methods very similar to those developed for DMFT models form etallic spin glasses.³⁴ Form ulating such a theory is technically possible because the exact quantum critical behavior is captured when the relevant eld theory is examined at the G aussian level,³⁵ in the considered limit of large dimensions.

Because of technical complexity of this calculation, we only report the main results, while the details can be found in Ref. [36]. In this paper, the full replica-symmetry broken (RSB) solution was found both around the quantum critical line and in the glassy phase. In the Ferm i liquid phase, the memory kernel was fond to take the form

$$V^{2}$$
 (!_n) = D (!_n) + q_{EA} !_n;0;

with

$$D(!_{n}) = y q_{A}^{2} = V^{4} \frac{p_{J_{n}} + p_{J_{n}}}{j!_{n} + j!_{n}}$$

Here, is a characteristic energy scale that vanishes on the critical line, which also determ ines a crossover temperature scale separating the Fermi liquid from the quantum -critical regime. In contrast to conventional quantum critical phenomena, but similarly as in metallic spin glasses, the "gap" scale = 0 not only on the critical line, but remains zero throughout the entire glassy phase. As a result, the excitations in this region assume a non-Fermi liquid form

$$D(!_{n}) = yq_{A}^{2} = V^{4}$$
 $p_{J_{n}}$

This behavior rects the emergence of soft "replicon" modes²² describing in our case represent low energy charge rearrangements inside the glassy phase. At nite temperatures, electrons undergo inelastic scattering from such collective excitations, leading to the temperature dependence of the resistivity that takes the following non-Fermi liquid form

$$(T) = (0) + A T^{3=2}$$
:

Interestingly, very recent experim ents³⁷ on two dimensional electron gases in silicon have revealed precisely such tem perature dependence of the resistivity. This behavior has been observed in what appears to be an interm ediate m etallic glass phase separating a conventional (Ferm i liquid) m etal at high carrier density, from an insulator at the low est densities.

A nother interesting feature of the predicted quantum critical behavior relates to disorder dependence of the crossover exponent describing how the gap scale r vanishes as a function of the distance r from the critical line. Calculations³⁸ show that = 2 in presence of site energy disorder, which for our m odel plays a role of a random symmetry breaking eld, and = 1 in its absence. This indicates that site disorder, which is common in disordered electronic systems, produces a particularly large quantum critical region, which could be the origin of large dephasing observed in m any m aterials near the m etal-insulator transition.

5.3.E ects of Anderson localization

As we have seen, the stability of the glassy phase is crucially determ ined by the electronic mobility at T = 0. More precisely, we have shown that the relevant energy scale that determ ines the size of quantum uctuations introduced by the electrons is given by the local resonance width". It is important to recall that precisely this quantity may be considered² as an order parameter for Anderson localization of noninteracting electrons. Very recent work^{13,24} demonstrated that the typical value of this quantity plays the same role even at a M ott-Anderson transition. We thus expect to generally vanish in the insulating state. As a result, we expect the stability of the glassy phase to be strongly a ected by Anderson localization elects, as we will explicitly demonstrate in the next section.

6.GLASSY BEHAVIOR NEAR THE MOTT-ANDERSON TRANSITION

On physical grounds, one expects the quantum uctuations³⁹ associated with mobile electrons to suppress glassy ordering, but their precise e ects remain to be elucidated. Note that even the amplitude of such quantum uctuations must be a singular function of the distance to the M IT, since they are dynam ically determined by processes that control the electronic mobility.

To clarify the situation, the following basic questions need to be addressed: (1) Does the M IT coincide with the onset of glassy behavior? (2) How do di erent physical processes that can localize electrons a ect the stability of the glass phase? In the following, we provide simple and physically transparent answers to both questions. We nd that: (a) G lassy behavior generally emerges before the electrons localize; (b) Anderson localization² enhances the stability of the glassy phase, while M ott localization¹ tends to suppress it.

In order to be able to exam ine both the e ects of Anderson and M ott localization, we concentrate on extended H ubbard m odels given by the H am iltonian

$$\label{eq:H} \begin{array}{cccccccc} H & = & X & & X & & X & \\ H & = & & (& t_{j} + \mbox{``i}\ j) c_{i;}^{V} \ c_{j;} \ + \ U & & n_{i"} n_{i\#} + & & V_{ij} \ n_{i} \ n_{j} : \\ & & i & & i \end{array}$$

Here, $n_i = n_i$ h_i irepresent local density uctuations (h_i i is the site-averaged electron density), U is the on-site interaction, and "i are Gaussian distributed random site energies of variance W². In order to allow for glassy freezing of electrons in the charge sector, we introduce weak inter-site density-density interactions V_{ij} , which we also also choose to be Gaussian distributed random variables of variance V² /z (z is the coordination number). We emphasize that, in contrast to previous work,²¹ we shall now keep the coordination number z nite, in order to allow for the possibility of Anderson localization. To investigate the emergence of glassy ordering, we form ally average over disorder by using standard replica methods,⁴⁰ and introduce collective Q – elds to decouple the inter-site V -term.⁴⁰ A mean – eld is then obtained by evaluating the Q – elds at the saddle-point level. The resulting stability criterion takes the form sim ilar as before

$$1 \quad V^{2} \quad [2]_{ij} l_{dis} = 0:$$
 (23)

Here, the non-local static com pressibilities are de ned (for a xed realization of disorder) as

$$n_{j} = 0 n_{i} = 0 n_{j};$$
 (24)

where n_i is the local quantum expectation value of the electron density, and [dis represents the average over disorder. O by by by, the stability of the glass phase is determined by the behavior of the four-order correlation function ${}^{(2)} = \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ ij \end{bmatrix}_{kis}$ in the vicinity of the metal-insulator transition. We emphasize that this quantity is to

be calculated in a disordered Hubbard model with nite range hopping, i.e. in the vicinity of the Mott-Anderson transition. The critical behavior of ⁽²⁾ is very di cult to calculate in general, but we will see that simple results can be obtained in the limits of weak and strong disorder, as follows.

6.1. Large disorder

As the disorder grows, the system approaches the Anderson transition at $t = t_c (M)$ W. The rst hint of singular behavior of ⁽²⁾ in an Anderson insulator is seen by exam ining the deeply insulating, i.e. atom ic lim it W t; where to leading order we set t = 0 and obtain $_{ij} = ("_i)_{ij}$, i.e. ⁽²⁾ = $[^2("_i)]_{dis} = +1$ diverges! Since we expect all quantities to behave in qualitatively the same fashion throughout the insulating phase, we anticipate ⁽²⁾ to diverge already at the Anderson transition. Note that, since the instability of the glassy phase occurs already at ⁽²⁾ = V², the glass transition m ust precede the localization transition. Thus, for any nite inter-site interaction V, we predict the emergence of an interm ediate m etallic glass phase separating the Ferm i liquid from the Anderson insulator. A ssum ing that near the transition

$$(2) \cdot \frac{A}{W^2} ((t=W) B)$$
 (25)

(A and $B = t_c = W$ are constants of order unity), from Eq. (23) we can estim ate the form of the glass transition line, and we get

$$t(W) = t_{0}(W) \quad t_{0}(W) \quad V^{2=} W^{\perp 2=}; W ! 1:$$
(26)

The glass transition and the Anderson transition lines are predicted to converge at large disorder for < 2; and diverge for > 2. Since all the known exponents characterizing the localization transition seem to grow with dimensionality, we may expect a particularly large metallic glass phase in large dimensions.

6.1.1. Anderson localization on Bethe lattice

In order to con m this scenario by explicit calculations, we compute the behavior of ⁽²⁾ at the Anderson transition of a half-led Bethe lattice of coordination z = 3W e use an essentially exact numerical approach²⁴ based on the recursive structure of the Bethe lattice.⁴¹ In this approach, local and non-local G reen's functions on a Bethe lattice can be sampled from a large ensemble, and the compressibilities _{ij} can be then calculated by examining how a local charge density n_i is modiled by an in nitesimal variation of the local site energy "_j on another site. To do this, we have taken special care in evaluating the local charge densities n_i by numerically computing the required frequency summations over the M atsubara axis, where the numerical di culties are



Figure 5. Phase diagram for the z = 3 Bethe lattice, valid in the large disorder limit. The inset shows ⁽²⁾ as a function of disorder W.

mpinimized. Using this method, we have calculated ⁽²⁾ as a function of W =t (for this lattice at half-lling E_F = 2² I), and nd that it decreases exponentially⁴² as the Anderson transition is approached. We emphasize that only a nite enhancement of ⁽²⁾ is required to trigger the instability to glassy ordering, which therefore occurs well before the Anderson transition is reached. The resulting T = 0 phase diagram, valid in the limit of large disorder, is presented in Fig. 1. Note that the glass transition line in this case has the form t_G (W) W, in agreement with the fact that exponential critical behavior of ⁽²⁾ corresponds to ! 1 in the above general scenario. These results are strikingly different from those obtained in a theory which ignores localization,²¹ where t_G (W) was found to be weakly dependent on disorder, and remain nite as W ! 1. Anderson localization transition, we do not expect the leading quantum critical behavior³⁶ at the FM G transition to be qualitatively modified by the localization e ects.

6.1.2. Typical m edium treatm ent of Anderson localization

As an alternative approach to the Bethe lattice calculation, in this section we introduce Anderson localization to the problem by using the formalism of "Typical Medium Theory"⁴³ (IMT). We calculate the cavity eld $_{\rm TYP}$ (!) by solving the relevant self-consistency condition,⁴³ which in turn allows us to nd local compress-ibilities:

$$_{ii} = \frac{@n}{@"_{i}} = \frac{1}{@"_{i}} \frac{@}{@"_{i}} \int_{1}^{Z_{0}} d! \operatorname{Im} G("_{i}; !; W)$$
(27)

$$G("_{i}; !; W) = \frac{1}{! !_{i} TYP(!)};$$
(28)

needed to determ ine the critical line of the glass transition. These calculations were performed using a model of sem icircular bare DOS $_0$ (!) and box distribution of disorder P ("i). The resulting phase diagram is shown in Fig. 6. The intermediate metallic glassy phase still exists, but shrinks as W ! 1, relating the small value of the critical exponent = 1, which can be shown analytically within TMT. A more realistic vales of this exponent, corresponding to d = 3 require more detailed numerical calculations, which remains a challenge for future work.



Figure 6. Phase diagram from Typical M edium Theory of Anderson localization,⁴³ giving = 1. The interm ediate m etallic glassy phase shrinks as disorder W grows, as expected. C om pare this to the B ethe lattice case Fig. 5, where = 1.

6.2. Low disorder - M ott transition

In the lim it of weak disorder W U;V, and interactions drive the metal-insulator transition. Concentrating on the model at half-lling, the system will undergo a M ott transition¹ as the hopping t is su ciently reduced. Since for the M ott transition $t_{M \text{ ott}}(U) = U$, near the transition W t, and to leading order we can ignore the localization e ects. In addition, we assume that V U; and to leading order the compressibilities have to be calculated with respect to the action Sel of a disordered Hubbard model. The simplest formulation that can describe the e ects of weak disorder on such a M ott transition is obtained from the dynam icalm ean-eld theory (DMFT).¹² This form ulation, which ignores localization e ects, is obtained by rescaling the hopping elements ${ar{z}}$ and then formally taking the limit of large coordination z ! 1 . To obtain qualitatively correct t ! t=' analytical results describing the vicinity of the disordered M ott transition at T = 0; we have solved the DM FT equations using a 4-boson method.40 At weak disorder, these equations can be easily solved in close form, and we simply report the relevant results. The critical value of hopping for the M ott transition is found to decrease with disorder, as

$$t_c(W)$$
 $f_c(1 + 4(W = U)^2 +);$ (29)

where for a simple sem i-circular density of states¹² $t_c^o = 3$ U=64 (in this model, the bandwidth B = 4t). Physically, the disorder tends to suppress the M ott insulating state, since it broadens the H ubbard bands and narrows the M ott-H ubbard gap. At su ciently strong disorder W U, the M ott insulator is suppressed even in the atom ic lim it t ! 0. The behavior of the compressibilities can also be calculated near the M ott transition, and to leading order we nd

$${}^{(2)} = \frac{8}{3 t_{c}^{o}} \left(1 - \frac{t_{c}(W)}{t}\right)^{2} \left(1 + 28(W = U)^{2}\right):$$
(30)

Therefore, as any compressibility, ⁽²⁾ is found to be very small in the vicinity of the M ott transition, even in presence of nite disorder. As a result, the tendency to glassy ordering is strongly suppressed at weak disorder, where one approaches the M ott insulating state.

Finally, having analyzed the lim its of weak and strong disorder, we brie y comment on what may be expected in the intermediate region W U. On general grounds, we expect a global phase diagram as shown in Fig.7. The Mott gap cannot exist for W > U, so in this region and for su ciently small t (i. e. kinetic energy), one enters an gapless (compressible) Mott-Anderson insulator. For W U; the computation of (2) requires



F igure 7. Schem atic phase diagram for an extended Hubbard model with disorder, as a function of the hopping element t and the disordered strength W, both expressed in units of the on-site interaction U. The size of the metallic glass phase is determined by the strength of the inter-site interaction V.

the full solution of the M ott-Anderson problem. The required calculations can and should be perform ed using the form ulation of R ef. 13,24, but that di cult task is a challeng for the future. However, based on general arguments presented above, we expect ⁽²⁾ to vanish as one approaches the M ott insulator (W < U), but to diverge as one approaches the M ott-Anderson insulator (W > U): Near the tetracritical point M (see Fig. 2), we may expect ⁽²⁾ W t; where W = W $W_{M ott}$ (t) is the distance to the M ott transition line, and t = t \pm (W) is the distance to the M ott-Anderson line. U sing this ansatz and Eq. (23), we not the glass transition line to take the form

$$t = t_{S}(W) \quad t_{E}(W) \quad W = ; W \quad W_{M} :$$
(31)

We thus expect the interm ediate m etallic glass phase to be suppressed as the disorder is reduced, and one approaches the M ott insulating state. Physically, glassy behavior of electrons corresponds to m any low -lying rearrangem ents of the charge density; such rearrangem ents are energetically unfavorable close to the (incom – pressible) M ott insulator, since the on-site repulsion U opposes charge uctuations. Interestingly, very recent experiments on low density electrons in silicon M O SFETs have revealed the existence of exactly such an interm ediate m etallic glass phase in low m obility (highly disordered) samples.³⁷ In contrast, in high m obility (low disorder) samples,⁴⁴ no interm ediate m etallic glass phase is seen, and glassy behavior emerges only as one enters the insulator, consistent with our theory. Sim ilar conclusions have also been reported in studies of highly disordered InO₂ Im s,⁷⁽¹¹ where the glassy slow ing down of the electron dynamics seems to be suppressed as the disorder is reduced and one crosses over from an Anderson-like to a M ott-like insulator. In addition, these experiments^{37,44} provide striking evidence of scale-invariant dynam ical correlations inside the glass phase, consistent with the hierarchical picture of glassy dynam ics, as generally emerging from m ean- eld approaches²² such as the one used in this work.

7.CONCLUSIONS

Recent years have witnessed enormous renewed interest in the metal-insulator transition. Scores of new and fascinating materials are being fabricated, with properties that could not be anticipated. A common theme in many of these systems is the presence of both the strong electron-electron interactions and disorder, a situation which proved di cult to analyze using conventional theoretical methods. In this paper, we have described a novel approach to this di cult problem, and shown that it can capture most relevant processes. This form ulation can easily be adapted to many realistic situations and will open new avenues for the development of materials science research.

ACKNOW LEDGMENTS

The author would like to acknow ledge his collaborators A.A.Pastor, M.H.Horbach, D.Tanaskovic, D.Dalidovich, L.A rrachea, and M.J.Rozenberg, with whom it was a pleasure to explore the physics of electron glasses. I also thank S.Bogdanovich, S.Chakravarty, J.Jaroszynski, D.Popovic, Z.Ovadyahu, J.Schmalian, and G. Zim anyi for useful discussions. This work was supported by the NSF grant DMR-9974311 and DMR-0234215, and the National High Magnetic Field Laboratory.

REFERENCES

- 1. N.F.M ott, M etal-Insulator transition, Taylor & Francis, London, 1990.
- 2. P.W. Anderson, \Absence of di usion in certain random lattices," Phys. Rev. 109, pp. 1492 [1505, 1958.
- 3. S. Sondhi, S.Girvin, J.Carini, and D.Shahar, \Continuous quantum phase transitions," Rev. Mod. Phys. 69, p. 315, 1997.
- 4. P.A. Lee and T.V. Ramakrishnan, \D isordered electronic system s," Rev. Mod. Phys. 57, p. 287, 1985.
- 5. J.H.Davies, P.A.Lee, and T.M.Rice, Electron glass," Phys. Rev. Lett. 49, pp. 758{761, 1982.
- 6. M. Pollak and A. Hunt, \Slow processes in disordered solids," in Hopping Transport in Solids, M. Pollak and B. I. Shklovskii, eds., pp. 175{206, Elsevier, Am sterdam, 1991.
- 7. M.Ben-Chorin, D.Kowal, and Z.Ovadyahu, \Anomalous eld e ect in gated Anderson insulators," Phys. Rev. B 44, pp. 3420{3423, 1991.
- 8. M. Ben-Chorin, Z. Ovadyahu, and M. Pollak, \Nonequilibrium transport and slow relaxation in hopping conductivity," Phys. Rev. B 48, pp.15025{15034,1993.
- 9. Z.O vadyahu and M.Pollak, \D isorder and m agnetic eld dependence of slow electronic relaxation," Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, pp. 459{462, 1997.
- 10. A. Vaknin, Z. Ovadyahu, and M. Pollak, \Evidence for interactions in nonergodic electronic transport," Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, pp. 669{672, 1998.
- 11. A. Vaknin, Z. Ovadyahu, and M. Pollak, \Aging e ects in an Anderson insulator," Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, pp. 3402{3405,2000.
- 12. A.Georges, G.Kotliar, W.Krauth, and M.J.Rozenberg, \D ynam icalmean-eld theory of strongly correlated ferm ion systems and the lim it of in nite dimensions," Rev. Mod. Phys. 68, p. 13, 1996.
- 13. V.D obrosavljevic and G.K otliar, \D ynam icalm ean- eld studies ofm etal-insulator transitions," Phil. Trans. R.Soc.Lond. A 356, p.1, 1998.
- 14. M.J.Rozenberg, G.Kotliar, and H.Kajueter, \Transfer of spectral weight in spectroscopies of correlated electron system s," Phys. Rev. B 54, p.8542, 1996.
- 15. J.G.M assey and M. Lee, \Low-frequency noise probe of interacting charge dynamics in variable-range hopping boron-doped silicon," Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, p. 3399, 1996.
- 16. A.L.E fros and B.I.Shklovskii, \Coulom b gap and low temperature conductivity of disordered system s," J.Phys.C 8, pp.L49{51, 1975.
- 17. G. Martinez-Arizala, C. Christiansen, D. E. Grupp, N. Markovic, A. M. Mack, and A. M. Goldman, \Coulom b-glass-like behavior of ultrathin lm s of metals," Phys. Rev. B 57, pp. R 670 {R 672, 1998.
- 18. D.Belitz and T.R.Kirkpatrick, \Anderson-M ott transition as a quantum -glass problem," Phys. Rev. B 52, p. 13922, 1995.

- 19. V. Dobrosavljevic, E. Abraham s, E. Miranda, and S. Chakravarty, \Scaling theory of two-dimensional metal-insulator transitions," Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, pp. 455{458, 1997.
- 20. S.Chakravarty, S.Kivelson, C.Nayak, and K.Voelker, Wigner glass, spin-liquids, and the metal-insulator transition," Phil. Mag. B 79, p. 859, 1999.
- 21. A.A. Pastor and V.D obrosavljevic, \M elting of the electron glass," Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, p. 4642, 1999.
- 22. M. Mezard, G. Parisi, and M. A. Virasoro, Spin Glass theory and beyond, World Scientic, Singapore, 1986.
- 23. V. Dobrosavljevic and G. Kotliar, \Strong correlations and disorder in d=1 and beyond," Phys. Rev. B 50, p. 1430, 1994.
- 24. V.D obrosavljevic and G.K otliar, \M ean eld theory of the M ott-Anderson transition," Phys. Rev. Lett. 78, p. 3943, 1997.
- 25. H. Z. Cummins, G. Li, W. M. Du, and J. Hernandez, \Relaxational dynamics in supercooled liquids: experimental tests of the mode coupling theory," Physica A 204, p. 169, 1994.
- 26. J. de Almeida and D. J.Thouless, \Stability of the sherrington-kirkpatrick solution of a spin glass model," J. Phys. A 11, p. 983, 1978.
- 27. M.M. ezard and A.P.Young, \Replica symmetry breaking in the random eld ising model," Europhys. Lett. 18, pp. 653{659, 1992.
- 28. R.G. Palmer and C.M. Pond, \Internal eld distribution in model spin glasses," J. Phys. F 9, p. 1451, 1979.
- 29. F. Pazmandi, G. Zarand, and G. T. Zimanyi, \Self-organized criticality in the hysteresis of the Sherrington-Kirkpatrick model," Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, pp. 1034 {1037, 1999.
- 30. T.N atterm ann, \Theory of the random eld Ising model," cond-m at/9705295, 1997.
- 31. A.A. Pastor, V.D obrosavreljevic, and M.L.Horbach, \M ean-eld glassy phase of the random eld Ising model," Phys. Rev. B 66, p. 014413 (14), 2001.
- 32. T. Plefka, \Convergence condition of the tap equation for the in nite-ranged Ising spin glass model," J. Phys. A 15, pp.1971{1978,1982.
- 33. A.Georges, M.Mezard, and J.S.Yedida, Low-temperature phase of the Ising spin glass on a hypercubic lattice," Phys. Rev. Lett. 64, p. 2937, 1990.
- 34. N. Read, S. Sachdev, and J. Ye, \Landau theory of quantum spin glasses of rotors and Ising spins," Phys. Rev. B 52, p. 384, 1995.
- 35. J.M iller and D.A.Huse, \Zero-tem perature critical behavior of the in nite-range quantum Ising spin glass," Phys. Rev. Lett. 70, p. 3147, 1993.
- 36. D.D. alidovich and V.D. obrosavljevic, \Landau theory of the Ferm i-liquid to electron-glass transition," Phys. Rev. B 66, p. 081107(4), 2002.
- 37. S.Bogdanovich and D.Popovic, \O nset of glassy dynam ics in a two-dimensional electron system in silicon," Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, p.236401(4), 2002.
- 38. L.Arrachea, D.D.alidovich, V.D.obrosavljevic, and M.J.Rozenberg, \M elting transition of an Ising glass driven by magnetic eld," Phys. Rev. B (in press), 2004.
- 39. A.A.Pastor and V.Dobrosavljevic, \M elting of the electron glass," Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, pp. 4642{4645, 1999.
- 40. V. Dobrosavljevic, D. Tanaskovic, and A. A. Pastor, \G lassy behavior of electrons near metal-insulator transitions," Phys. Rev. Lett. 90, p. 016402(4), 2003.
- 41. R.Abou-Chacra, P.W. Anderson, and D. Thouless, \A selfconsistent theory of localization," J. Phys. C 6, p.1734, 1973.
- 42. A.D.M irlin, \Statistics of energy levels and eigenfunctions in disordered system s," Phys. Rep. 326, p. 259, 2000.
- 43. V.D obrosavljevic, A.Pastor, and B.K.Nikolic, \Typicalmedium theory of Anderson localization: A local order parameter approach to strong disorder e ects," Europhys. Lett. 62, pp. 76{82, 2003.
- 44. J. Jaroszynski, D. Popovic, and T. M. K lapwijk, \Universal behavior of the resistance noise across the metal-insulator transition in silicon inversion layers," Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, p. 276401 (4), 2002.