N on exponential quasiparticle decay and phase relaxation in low dimensional conductors

G . M ontam \texttt{baux}^1 and E . A kkerm \texttt{ans}^2

¹Laboratoire de Physique des Solides, CNRS UMR 8502, Universite Paris-Sud, 91405 Orsay, France

²D epartm ent of Physics, Technion Israel Institute of Technology, 32000 Haifa, Israel

(D ated: A pril 14, 2024)

W e show that in low dimensional disordered conductors, the quasiparticle decay and the relaxation of the phase are not exponential processes. In the quasi-one dimensional case, both behave at sm all time as e $(t = in)^{3=2}$ where the inelastic time in, identical for both processes, is a power T²⁼³ of the temperature. The non exponential quasiparticle decay results from a modiled derivation of the Fermi golden rule. This result im plies the existence of an unusual distribution of relaxation times.

PACS num bers: 71.10 Fd,71.10 H f,71.27.+ a

The issue of dephasing in the presence of electronelectron interactions in disordered conductors is of great importance in mesoscopic physics. This problem, rst addressed by Altshuler, A ronov and K hm elnitskii (AAK) [1], has been recently revisited in the light of a new set of experiments [2, 3, 4]. A related problem is the understanding of the time evolution of a quasiparticle state due to electron-electron interaction, which governs the relaxation towards therm al equilibrium [5]. Since coherent e ects in disordered system s result from the coherent pairing of two scattering am plitudes de ned for a given quasiparticle state, the coherence is lost once this state has relaxed. Thus it seems natural to assume that quasiparticle and phase relaxations are of the same nature [6] and are driven by the same time scale. In this letter, we show that in low dimensional disordered conductors and in particular for quasi-one-dim ensional (quasi-1d) wires, both relaxations are faster than exponential and are driven by the sam e characteristic tim e [7]. This non exponential behavior re ects the existence of a distribution of relaxation times. Such a non exponential decay is unusual in quantum condensed matter physics but m ore frequent in the context ofm olecular relaxation processes and in glassy systems. Stretched and compressed exponentials are mostly used as a way to t unusual relaxations but no microscopic basis can be assigned to account for this behavior [8]. Here, we derive it from a new treatment of the Fermigolden rule.

We shall rst consider the quasiparticle decay, using the Ferm igoken rule [9]. We show that, due to screened C oulom b interactions with sm all energy transfer, the relaxation rate is not constant, im plying a non exponential decay. This results from a key step in the Ferm i goken rule which stems that the transitions conserve energy within h=t where t is the duration of the perturbation. U sually this constraint is ofno practical im portance and energy conservation is described by a delta function. Here we show that this is no longer possible. As a result, we nd that for quasi-1d wires, the probability for a quasiparticle to stay in its initial state behaves, at sm all times, as P (t) = e $(t = in)^{3-2}$. The temperature dependence of the inelastic time is in (T) / T $^{2-3}$ and is a numerical constant.

Then, we shall come to the relaxation of phase coherence. It is given by the average heⁱ ^(t) i of the relative phase (t) between time reversed trajectories. Starting from the AAK calculation, we show that the phase relaxation is also non-exponential and that, at sm all times, it behaves like heⁱ ^(t) i' e ^{(t=)³⁼²} where the phase coherence time is proportional to the quasiparticle decay time _{in}.

W e start by considering the decay of a quasiparticle, recalling rst som e known features of the derivation. Using the Ferm i golden rule, the quasiparticle lifetim e can be written in terms of a kernel K (!) which is the average over disorder of the squared matrix element of the screened C oulom b interaction [7, 10]:

$$\frac{h}{\ln (\Gamma)} = 8 \int_{0}^{2} d! K (!) \frac{!}{\sinh h!} ; \quad (1)$$

where $_0$ is the total density of states per spin direction. The tem perature dependence results from the occupancy of the initial and nalquasiparticle states. Upon disorder averaging, the kernel K (!) is obtained as the squared product of the dynam ically screened interaction and of a long range contribution called di uson. As a result, we have [5]:

K (!) =
$$\frac{1}{4^{2} \cdot \frac{4}{0}} \frac{X}{q} \cdot \frac{1}{!^{2} + D^{2}q^{4}}$$
 : (2)

The di usive nature of the electronic motion implies a strong dependence of the transition probability upon the space dimensionality d that appears in the sum over the modes q. The kernel K (!) then depends on the space dimensionality d and it is given by [5] K (!) = $(_{d}=16, \frac{4}{0}!^{2})$ (!=E_c)^{d=2} where $_{1} = \frac{p}{2}=^{2}$, $_{2} = 1=2^{2}$, $_{3} = \frac{12}{2}=^{2}$ and E_c = D =L² is the Thouless frequency. For d = 3, the integral in (1) is convergent so that in (T) is wellde ned and behaves like T ³⁼². However ford 2,

the integral in (1) diverges at low energy transfer !. To cure this divergence, it is commonly argued that the low frequency cut-o needed is $1 = _{in}$ itself, since no energy transfer can be smaller than $h = _{in}$. Consequently, the lifetime is solution of a self-consistent equation whose solution in d = 1 is :

$$\frac{1}{\ln (\Gamma)} = -\frac{T e^{2^{p}} \overline{D}}{S h^{2}} :$$
(3)

where the conductivity is $= 2e^2 _0 D = (LS)$. This tem – perature dependence has been rst obtained by A ltshuler and A ronov [5].

W e argue here that this divergence is indeed the signature of a new behavior for the quasiparticle decay. W e prove that this decay is actually non exponential. The crucial point in our argum ent is that it is not correct to cut-o the integral at $1 = {}_{\rm in}$. To grasp the relevance of this statem ent, it is in portant to recall the Ferm igolden rule prescription namely that, after a time t, the range of accessible states is limited to energies larger than h=t, not h= ${}_{\rm in}$. This leads to the replacem ent of Eq.(1) by the follow ing expression for the disorder averaged transition probability P ⁽²⁾ (t) towards nal states, calculated up to second-order in perturbation :

$$P^{(2)}(t) = \frac{d^{T}}{2 d^{2}} t^{2} \frac{d^{T}}{d^{2}} \frac{d!}{t^{2}} \frac{d!}{t^{2}} \frac{d!}{E_{c}}$$
(4)

where, for simplicity, the thermal factor has been replaced by an upper cut-o at h! T. We have used the above expressions for the kernel in d dimensions. In one dimension, this leads immediately to a $t^{3=2}$ power law : $P^{(2)}(t) = \frac{p \frac{2T}{2T}}{0^{h^2 + E_o}} t^{3=2}$ so that the quasiparticle relaxation is not exponential.

Let us prove now this qualitative statement, coming back to the derivation of the Fermi golden rule. A given initial quasiparticle state interacts with a quasiparticle of energy , leading to two quasiparticles of nalenergies

and .Asknown from quantum mechanics textbooks [11], the transition probability towards nal states is :

$$P^{(2)}(t) = 2^{X} J ; f_{t}(-+)$$
 (5)

where U $\ ; \$ is the matrix element of the interaction. The function f_t (!) of width $\ = t$ is given by [11]

$$f_t(!) = \frac{\sin ! t=2}{!=2}^2$$
 : (6)

Its maximum is equal to t^2 and its integral is 2 t. U sually, this function can be approximated by 2 t (!), so that the decay is linear in t, and the prefactor is the inverse quasiparticle time.

The main idea here is that this approximation is not always valid. To see this, we rst calculate the disorder




FIG. 1: Plot of the function h(!t). It vanishes for small argument, justifying the cut-o of order 1=t in Eq. (4).

average of Eq. (5) using standard m ethods [7]. The new input is that the energy of the initial and nal states may di er by a small am ount ! of order 1=t, as explicitly seen on Eqs.(5) and (6). As a result, the di usons and dynamically screened interactions which enter in the kernel K have to be taken at di erent frequencies ! = ! !=2. This im mediately leads to a kernel K ! (!) which now depends on the energy di erence ! :

$$K_{!}(!) = \frac{1}{4^{2} \frac{4}{0}} X_{q \in 0} \frac{1}{(!^{2}_{+} + D^{2}q^{4})(!^{2}_{+} + D^{2}q^{4})}$$
(7)

instead of (2). This kernel yields to a transition probability of the form :

$$P^{(2)}(t) = \frac{4 {}_{0}^{3}T}{h^{2}} {}_{0}^{T=h} d! g_{t}(!) ; \qquad (8)$$

where
$$g_t(!) = d! f_t(!)K_! (!)$$
; (9)

Letting $f_t(!) = 2 t (!)$ leads in mediately to the usual result, namely a behavior of P⁽²⁾ (t) linear in t and de nes $1 = i_n$ provided the integral is convergent.

However in 1d, when ! = 0, K $_{!=0}(!) = K(!) / 1=!^{3=2}$ and the integral on ! becomes divergent. It is thus crucial to keep the full expression of $f_t(!)$. Doing this, we nd that for ! 1=t, we still have $g_t(!) = 2 \text{ tK } (!) / t=!^{3=2}$, while for ! 1=t, it is easy to check, since $f_t(0) = t^2$, that the function $g_t(!) / t^2 = T$, so that its integral near zero frequency is indeed convergent. M ore precisely, we can show that $g_t(!)$ is of the form $g_t(!) = 2 \text{ tK } (!)h(!t)$ where the function h(!t) is linear for sm all argument and tends to 1 for large argument. This function is calculated numerically and is shown on F ig. 1. The quasiparticle decay probability takes the form

$$P^{(2)}(t) = \frac{Tt}{P \overline{2}h^2 0 \overline{E_c}} \int_{0}^{Z_1} \frac{d!}{!^{3=2}} h(!t) :$$
(10)

We have thus proven that the cut-o in (4) appears as a natural consequence of a proper use of the Ferm i golden rule. M ore precisely, because of the function h which naturally provides a lower cut-o of order 1=t, the integral now converges and

$$P^{(2)}(t) = \frac{p \overline{2}e^{2} p \overline{D} T}{Sh^{2}} t^{3=2} \int_{0}^{Z} \frac{dx}{x^{3=2}} h(x) : \qquad (11)$$

At small times, the survival probability P (t), i.e. the probability that a quasiparticle stays in its original state, is given by P (t) = 1 $P^{(2)}$ (t). By exponentiating this relation, we obtain :

$$P(t) = e^{\frac{t}{in}^{3=2}}$$
: (12)

The survival probability is thus given by a compressed exponential characterized by the inelastic time Eq.(3) and where ' 5.83[°] $\overline{2}$ =. Similarly, in two dimensions for a lm of thickness a, using (4), one nds a logarithm ic correction P (t) e $\frac{t}{\ln} \frac{1}{\ln T t}$ with $\frac{1}{\ln}$ (T) / $\frac{e^2 T}{h^2 a}$. These temporal behaviors constitute one of the main results of this paper. We emphasize again that there are direct consequences of the Ferm i golden rule prescription according to which the energy is conserved, not within the decay rate h= in, but rather within the inverse time h=t [1].

Now, one can wonderwhether this peculiar behavior of the energy relaxation has its signature in the time dependence of the phase relaxation of coherent e ects in weakly disordered systems. These e ects result from the coherent pairing of two scattering amplitudes de ned for a given quasiparticle state. In particular, we consider pairs oftim e reversed trajectories (the cooperon) as it appears in the weak-localization correction to the conductivity. The relaxation of the cooperon is driven by a charactercalled the phase coherence time. It seems istic tim e quite intuitive that, as far as Coulomb interactions are involved, the quasiparticle decay and the cooperon relaxation are related. Thus the question arises of the relation between the inelastic time in and the phase coherence . We shall now show that these two relaxation time processes are indeed identical and characterized by the sam e tim e scale.

To that purpose, we consider the time relaxation of the cooperon by replacing the C oulom b interaction by a classical uctuating potential V (r_i) whose characteristics are determined by the uctuation-dissipation theorem [1]. The cooperon contribution to the return probability can be written under the form :

$$P_{c}(r;r;t) = P_{c}^{(0)}(r;r;t) \stackrel{D}{e^{i}} \stackrel{E}{}_{r;t}^{(r;t)}$$
(13)

where $P_c^{(0)}$ is the cooperon in the absence of the uctuating potential and = (r;t) is the relative phase of a pair of time reversed trajectories at time t:

$$= \frac{1}{h} \int_{0}^{Z_{t}} [V(r();) V(r();)] d \qquad (14)$$

This expression is valid in the eikonal approximation i.e. for a slow ly varying potential whose e ect is to multiply the disorder averaged G reen function by a phase term proportional to the circulation of V (r();) along the trajectory between the times 0 and t. We de ne⁻ = t \cdot .

The dephasing is accumulated along the diusive electronic trajectories paired in the cooperon. One of them propagates in the time interval 0 t w hereas its time reversed counterpart propagates from = t to= 0. We denote by h $T_{:C}$ the average taken both over the distribution of the di usive trajectories (h c) and over the therm al uctuations (h $_{\rm T}$) of the electric potential. The latter are G aussian so that the therm alaverage e^{i} $_{T} = e^{\frac{1}{2}h^{2}i_{T}}$. Using (14) and the uctuationdissipation theorem in the classical limit (h! 1), namely, hV (q;!)V (q;!) $i = \frac{2e^2T}{c^2}$, we obtain for the dephasing the follow ing expression

$${}^{2}_{T} = \frac{4e^{2}T}{h^{2}} \int_{0}^{Z_{t}} d \frac{dq}{(2)^{d}} \frac{1}{q^{2}} \frac{\cos(r() r())}{q^{2}}$$
(15)

The average h $\cos q:(r() r_{\tau}))i$ over the di usive trajectories of time t is e $2^{D}q^{2}$ j¹ = tj. For a quasi-1d w ire, the integrations over q and lead to

$${}^{2}_{\text{T,C}} = \frac{p - e^{2} T}{2h^{2} S} \frac{p}{D} t^{3=2} = \frac{p}{2} - \frac{t}{in}$$
(16)

A ssuming rst that $e^{\frac{1}{2}h^2 i_T E}$, $e^{\frac{1}{2}h^2 i_{T,c}}$, we obtain for the cooperon, at small time, the compressed exponential behavior

$$e^{i}$$
 _{T,C} ' e^{p} =4 (t= in)³⁼² (17)

identical to the energy relaxation (12) and with the same characteristic time in given by (3). A similar behavior for the phase relaxation has been also found in [12]. It is interesting at this stage to compare (15) with (4) obtained for the transition probability of a quasiparticle state. A lthough these expressions behave sim ilarly, the convergence in Eq.(4) results from a cut-o at small ! whose origin is in the Ferm i golden rule prescription namely, that among the large number of accessible states in d = 1, only those with energy transfer larger than h=t are accessible after a time t. This low energy cuto does not exist in (15) and the convergence results from the compensation between the two term s in the bracket that describe respectively the contributions of the correlations hV (r();)V (r(0); 0) i_{T} and hV (r();)V (r(0); $^{-0}$) i_{T} to the cooperon.

The result (17) is not fully correct since we have approximated the average h $_{\rm C}$ of the exponential by the exponential of the average. Using the functional integral approach presented in [1], there is a way to derive an expression for the phase relaxation valid at all




FIG.2: Behaviour of heⁱ (t) $i_{T,C}$. The continuous line is the exact result (20). The dotted line is obtained from the small time expansion (17). The dashed line shows the exponential te te^{t=2} in.

tim es by considering the Laplace transform P (r;r) = $dtP_c(r;r;t)e^{-t}$ of the cooperon. In quasi-1d, one has :

$$P(r;r) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{r}{D} \frac{in}{A i^{0}(in=)} \frac{A i(m=)}{A i^{0}(in=)}$$
(18)

where A iet A i^0 are respectively the A iry function and its derivative [13] and = 1=. The probability P_c(r;r;t) in (13) can thus be obtained from the inverse Laplace transform of (18). Since, in the quasi one-dimensional limit, one has P_c⁽⁰⁾(r;r;t) = 1= $\frac{p}{4}$ Dt, the dephasing term eⁱ T_i is a function of t= in that satisfies

$$\sum_{0}^{Z_{1}} \frac{dt}{p} = e^{i} e^{i} e^{t} = p - \frac{Ai(in)}{Ai(in)}$$
(19)

The inverse Laplace transform is obtained by noticing that the A iry function and its derivative are analytic and non m erom orphic functions whose zeroes lie on the negative real axis. Then, by perform ing the integral in the complex plane with the residues $R \exp(e^{st}A i(s) = A i^0(s)) = e^{ju_n jt} = ju_n j$ where the u_n are the zeros of $A i^0(s)$ given at a very good approximation by $ju_n j = \frac{3}{2} (n - \frac{3}{4})^{2=3}$ [13], we obtain the analytic function

$$e^{i}_{T,C} = \frac{r}{\frac{t}{in}} \frac{k}{k} \frac{e^{ju_{n}jt=in}}{ju_{n}j}$$
 (20)

At small times $t < i_n$, it behaves like Eq.(17). At large time, the relaxation is driven by the rst zero of the A i⁰ function, namely eⁱ $_{T,C}$, $t = i_n e^{ju_1 t = i_n} = ju_1 j$ with $ju_1 j$, 1:019. Clearly, the relaxation (20) is never exponential. It appears as a distribution of relaxation times $i_n = ju_n j$ which is at the origin of the rather unexpected compressed exponential behavior of the quasiparticle decay and of the cooperon phase relaxation. The expression (20) constitutes one of the main results of this paper. The question arises of how this behavior could show up experimentally. It has been stressed by Pierre et al. [4], that the Laplace transform (18) is well approxim ated by the relation P $(r;r) = (1=2^{p} D)^{\frac{1}{D}} + \frac{a}{in}^{1=2}$ where a' 1=2 is an adjustable numerical constant. This approximation corresponds to an exponential relaxation heⁱ (t)</sup> $i_{T,C}$ ' e ^{t=2} in that is clearly at odd with the behavior (20) (see Fig. 2). However, the di erence between the exact relation and the exponential approximation is di cult to see experimentally. The time accounts for other processes such as the decay rate in a magnetic eld which, for a wire of section S, is given by $1 = \frac{1}{B} = D S^2 e^2 B^2 = 3h^2$ [14]. A possibility to probe the t³⁼² behavior at sm all time is to study the lim it B in where the weak localization correction to the conductivity is

$$\frac{e^{2} p}{h} \frac{p}{D_{B}} \frac{1}{1} \frac{1}{4} \frac{B}{in}$$
(21)

The power-law dependence of the correction term in (21) is a direct signature of the $t^{3=2}$ behavior of the relaxation at small time. The asymptotic behavior (B)

(B ! 1) / T=B ⁴ re ects both the T ²⁼³ dependence of _{in} and the non exponential $t^{3=2}$ phase relaxation. A nother direct probe of the non exponential relaxation of the phase should m ay also be provided by the behavior of the ac conductivity (!).

This research was supported in part by the Israel A cademy of Sciences, by the Fund for Promotion of Research at the Technion, and by the French-IsraeliA rc-enciel program.

- [1] B.L.Altshuler et al., J. Phys. C 15, 7367 (1982)
- [2] P.M ohanty et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 78, 3366 (1997)
- [3] A.B.Gougam et al, J.Low Tem p. Phys. 118, 447 (2000)
- [4] F.Pierre et al, Phys.Rev.B 68, 85413 (2003)
- [5] B.L.Altshuler and A.G.Aronov, in "Electron-electron interactions in disordered systems", A.L.E fros and M. Pollak eds., p.1 (Elsevier 1985)
- [6] Y. Im ry, Introduction to M esoscopic Physics, 2nd edition (O xford, 2002)
- [7] E. Akkermans and G. Montambaux, Physique Mesoscopique des electrons et des photons, CNRS-Intereditions (2004)
- [8] J.C. Phillips, Rep. Prog. Phys. 59, 1133 (1996)
- It can also be obtained from the imaginary part of the self-energy : E.Abraham s et al., Phys. Rev. B 24, 6783 (1981)
- [10] W .Eiler, J.Low Tem p.Phys. 56, 481 (1984)
- [11] A. M essiah, Quantum M echanics, Chap. X V II, D over (1999)
- [12] A.Stem et al, Phys.Rev.A 41, 3436 (1990)
- [13] M . A bram ovitz and I. Stegun, H andbook of m athem atical functions, D over (1970)
- [14] B L.A Lishuler and A G.Aronov, JE T P. Lett. 33, 499 (1981)