

First-principles generation of Stereographic Maps for high-field magnetoresistance in normal metals: an application to Au and Ag.

Roberto De Leo*

*Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, sez. di Cagliari
Cittadella Universitaria, I-09042 Monserrato (CA), Italy*

(Dated: January 9, 2022)

About thirty high-field magnetoresistance Stereographic Maps have been measured for metals between Fifties and Seventies but no way was known till now to compare these complex experimental data with first-principles computations. We present here the method we developed to generate Stereographic Maps directly from a metal's Fermi Surface, based on the Lifshitz model and the recent advances by S.P. Novikov and his pupils. As an application, we test the method with an interesting toy model and then with Au and Ag.

PACS numbers: 72.15.Gd, 02.40.Re, 03.65.Sq

I. INTRODUCTION

The relevance of the geometry and topology of the Fermi Surface (FS) in physical phenomena is well known since Thirties, when Justi and Scheffers showed evidences that the Fermi Surface of Gold is open¹.

One of the most striking examples of such phenomena is the behaviour of magnetoresistance in monocrystals at low temperatures in high magnetic fields. Evidences for this effect was first discovered theoretically by Lifshitz and his Karkov school in Fifties² by studying galvanometric effects in metals without any special assumption for the electron energy spectrum, and it was verified experimentally by Gaidukov *et al.* shortly afterwards^{3,4}.

What was clear from those early works is that, under the conditions stated above (and apart from the exceptional case when the density of electrons and holes are equal) the magnetoresistance behaviour is dictated only by the topological properties of orbits of quasi-momenta (see fig.1): as the magnetic field $\mathbf{H}$ grows, the magnetoresistance saturates isotropically to an asymptotic value if the orbits are all closed, while it grows quadratically with $\mathbf{H}$ if there are open orbits; moreover, in this last case the magnetoresistance is not isotropic and the conductivity tensor σ has rank 1.

Many works about this effect were published between Fifties and Seventies from both the experimental^{3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12} and theoretical^{2,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21} point of view; in particular, Stereographic Maps (SM) were experimentally built by plotting in a stereographic projection all magnetic field directions $\mathbf{H}$ in which a quadratic rise of σ was observed (see fig.2). In those times the interest on these magnetoresistance effects was due mainly to their utility as a tool to determine FS properties rather than as phenomena in their own right, and in particular SM maps provided information about FS topology: e.g. clearly if σ grows quadratically for some direction of $\mathbf{H}$ then the FS must be open, and further analysis can lead

to discover the directions of the openings.

Between Fifties and Seventies SM were experimentally found for about thirty metals but, despite the theoretical efforts, no way was found to generate them with first-principles calculations and therefore no accurate direct verification of the Lifshitz model is available to date, except for the qualitative sketches by Lifshitz and Peschanskii¹⁶ (see fig.2); in particular it was not known till now how closely the semiclassical model is able to reproduce these complex experimental data and whether further purely quanta-mechanical corrections are needed.

As the magnetoresistance methods were replaced by newer and more accurate tools to study FS, no new SM was experimentally produced and the problem was eventually abandoned; it was only in Nineties that the beautiful topological structure underlying this phenomenon, this time considered in its own right rather than as a tool for something else, was fully discovered, making this way finally possible the construction of an algorithm able to reproduce from first-principles the experimental data about the dependence of σ on the direction of $\mathbf{H}$ for any given Fermi Function (FF) $\mathcal{E}$.

In 1982 indeed S.P. Novikov²² recognized the purely topological character of the problem and later²³ extracted the following generic picture from the work of his students A. Zorich²⁴ and I.V. Dynnikov^{25,26,27}: once a Fermi Surface (FS) is given, if open orbits arise for electrons quasi-momenta for some direction of the magnetic field, then the set of such directions are sorted in some finite number of "islands" (e.g see fig. 2); to each of these islands it is associated a new quantum invariant $\mathbf{L}$ (an irreducible Miller index of the lattice) that defines the dynamic of the semiclassical system in the following way: each open orbit corresponding to a $\mathbf{H}$ that belongs to an island labeled by $\mathbf{L}$ is a finite deformation of a straight line parallel to the vector product $\mathbf{H} \times \mathbf{L}$. All $\mathbf{H}$ that do not fall in any of these islands give rise only to closed orbits, except for a negligible set of exceptional directions that we will disregard here.

In this article we present the method, suggested to us




FIG. 1: Behaviour of $\rho = \sigma^{-1}$ in metals with closed and open FS³². (Closed) ρ is isotropic and saturates unless the density of electrons and holes coincide, in which case $\rho \sim H^2$. (Open) ρ is highly anisotropic and it shows qualitatively different behaviour in minima and maxima (resp. θ_2 and θ_1 in the picture): in maxima $\rho \sim H^2$, in minima it saturates (θ is the angle between $\mathbf{H}$ and the crystallographic axis).

by I. Dynnikov, that we implemented, based on this picture, to detect the directions of the magnetic field for which open orbits of quasi-momenta appear. This algorithm allows us to predict the SM of a metal according to the Lifshitz model, namely to determine the part of the “islands” that the semiclassical approximation is sufficient to detect. As an application, we first study the SM of a very rich and simple toy model and then we generate SM for Au and Ag and compare our results with the ones obtained experimentally more than forty years ago by Gaidukov (and never repeated since then); this represents the first rigorous check of Gaidukov’s results from first-principles and shows that, even though the SM were measured just at the lower threshold for the semiclassical approximation to hold, the Lifshitz model is able to reproduce rather accurately the experimental data.

II. OVERVIEW OF THE LIFSHITZ MODEL

A great deal of energies have been invested in Fifties and Sixties in the study of magnetoresistance in a metal. After the discovery by Kapitza²⁸ of a linear increase of the resistivity with a magnetic field in a number of metals, it had been shown by Justi¹ that metals could be divided in two categories: for the first one the resistivity saturates with the increase of the magnetic field (e.g. in Cu, Na, Al) while for the second one it grows quadratically (e.g. in noble metals).

It was Peierls²⁹ the first to recognize that this anomalous behaviour was due to the departures from the free-electron model, but it was especially thanks to the theoretical works of I.M. Lifshitz and his school^{2,6,15} and to the experimental results of Alekseevskii and Gaidukov^{3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11} that a systematic and thorough study of this phenomenon was carried on and fully revealed its critical dependence on the topology of the FS. In particular, Lifshitz was the first to study the system in its full generality, making no assumption on the form of the FF.

Let us review quickly the mathematics of the model to show the role topology has in it^{30,31}. Since no analytical method to solve exactly the Schrodinger equation under a generic periodic potential is known, we will make, as usual, a first approximation introducing the semiclassical model, i.e. we neglect the electron-electron interaction and consider the motion of a single electron in an infinite crystal. According to the semiclassical approximation, the Schrodinger equation for a single electron in a three-dimensional lattice Γ with a Γ -invariant potential in presence of an electric field $\mathbf{E}$ and a magnetic field $\mathbf{H}$ reduces to the following (semi-)classical equations of motion:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\mathbf{q}} &= v_n(\mathbf{p}) = \frac{\partial \mathcal{E}_n(\mathbf{p})}{\partial \mathbf{p}} \\ \dot{\mathbf{p}} &= -e \left[\mathbf{E} + \frac{1}{c} v_n(\mathbf{p}) \times \mathbf{H} \right] \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{E}_n(\mathbf{p})$ is the energy function for the electron occupying the band n .

Physical constraints limit the range of the magnetic field: electrons become aware of the FS topology only if the mean free path is long enough to traverse considerable portions of it, that requires $\omega_c \tau \gg 1$ (and so a field $H \geq 10T$), a pure crystal and very low temperatures; on the other side, to avoid magnetic breakdown we also must have $H \leq 10^3 T$.

The semiclassical approximation makes the problem look at first sight as a standard classical mechanics system but it turns out that it is instead deeply different from all of them. The difference is not in the analytical expression of the equations, that is evidently the same, but rather in the *topology* of the phase space: in classical mechanics indeed the momenta belongs always to a linear space, no matter how complicated the base space is; here instead the base space is topologically trivial (the whole three-space) but the momenta are triply periodic by the Bloch theorem, since we identify all momenta that differ by a vector of the dual lattice Γ^* . In more rigorous terms, while in classical mechanics momenta would belong to the linear space $\mathbb{R}^3$, in this case they are defined only modulo a vector of the reciprocal lattice and there-

fore they belong to the first Brillouin zone, i.e., in other words, to the three-torus $\mathbb{T}^3 = \mathbb{R}^3/\Gamma^*$.

This difference is *essential* because it is exactly what brings topology (in this case “periodic topology”) in play: the three-torus, differently from the three-space, has a non-trivial topology and its presence has a strong influence on the dynamics of the system. Indeed, if both $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{H}$ are constant, the pair of (systems of) equations de-couples and the problem reduces to study the orbits of the quasi-momenta in the first Brillouin zone (with the obvious boundary conditions dictated by the periodicity) under the equation:

$$\dot{\mathbf{p}} = -e \left[\mathbf{E} + \frac{1}{c} \frac{\partial \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{p})}{\partial \mathbf{p}} \times \mathbf{H} \right]$$

As often happens, topological effects are due to the magnetic field rather than to the electric one and therefore we can safely put $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{0}$ and $e = c = 1$ and we are finally left with the equation:

$$\dot{\mathbf{p}} = - \frac{\partial \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{p})}{\partial \mathbf{p}} \times \mathbf{H} = \{\mathbf{p}, \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{p})\}_{\mathbf{H}}$$

where $\{\cdot, \cdot\}_{\mathbf{H}}$ is the so-called “magnetic bracket”:

$$\{p_\alpha, p_\beta\}_{\mathbf{H}} = \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} H^\gamma$$

It is well known that this system is over-integrable since it has two integrals of motion, namely the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{E}$ and the component $\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{H}$ of the quasi-momentum in the magnetic field direction; nevertheless it was not fully understood until Eighties the relevance of the fact that the latter integral is not a well defined *single*-valued function in $\mathbb{T}^3$ but rather a *multi*-valued function, exactly in the same way the angle θ is just a multivalued function in the circle $\mathbb{S}^1$.

Let us point out that not even the most elementary systems with multivalued first integrals have been object of study till recent years by the dynamical systems community, probably because no such system arises naturally from classical mechanics problems. This appearance of a multivalued first integral, whose occurrence is due to the non-trivial topology of $\mathbb{T}^3$ and could not arise in a topologically trivial space like $\mathbb{R}^3$, it’s enough to transform an otherwise trivial dynamical system in an extremely rich one. For example, cutting level surfaces of $\mathcal{E}$ with level surfaces of another well-defined function on $\mathbb{T}^3$ would lead only to closed orbits in the Brillouin zone, while in our case open orbits do generically arise, orbits that may in principle fill the whole FS in the same way a straight line with 3-irrational slope would fill the whole Brillouin zone.

The topology of the orbits, namely whether they are open or closed (in the repeated zone scheme), is not just a mathematical curiosity: it has been first showed by Lifshitz indeed that the cause of the quadratic growth of the magnetoresistance is exactly the presence of open orbits. A rigorous deduction of this fact can be made using the




FIG. 2: (a) SM of Gold measured by Gaidukov in 1959³ (b) Qualitative sketch of the previous picture obtained by Lifshitz from his topological analysis³⁴

Boltzman transport equation³³ but simpler justifications of it can be made³² at a phenomenological level based on the Einstein relation $\sigma \simeq \mathcal{D} e^2 n / \mathcal{E}_F$, where $\mathcal{D}$ is the diffusion coefficient and $\mathcal{E}_F$ the Fermi Energy. When all orbits are closed indeed the diffusion in the plane perpendicular to $\mathbf{H}$ consists in jumps by an amount of the order of the cyclotron radius $r_H = c p_F / e H$ with frequency $\sim 1/\tau$, so that $\mathcal{D} \simeq l v \simeq r_H^2 / \tau$ and $\sigma \simeq \sigma_0 / (\omega_c \tau)^2$; now suppose instead that quasi-momenta open orbits appear instead, say in the x direction: then the electrons will move along the y direction, since the orbits in the real space are rotated by $\pi/2$ with respect to orbits in the momentum space, so that in the x direction $\mathcal{D}$ has more or less the same $\mathbf{H}$ dependence found for the closed orbits but in the orthogonal direction electrons move as free particles, namely $\mathcal{D}_{yy} \simeq v_F^2 \tau$, and therefore in this case σ is not isotropic anymore and $\sigma_{xx} \simeq \sigma_0 / (\omega_c \tau)^2$, $\sigma_{yy} \simeq \sigma_0$.

The theoretical results by Lifshitz and his school urged Alekseevskii and Gaidukov to start conducting careful experiments that turned out to be in perfect agreement with the model. The most interesting experimental result for us is the stereographic projection of the special direction for the magnetic field (Stereographic Map), namely the map on the unitary disc that shows for which directions the magnetoresistance grows quadratically. Such map indeed, in the semiclassical approximation, depends solely on the orbits topology and therefore it is totally determined once a Fermi Surface is given. A great effort has been spent to find some kind of algorithm able to produce this map from a generic FS^{15,16,17}, but the topological tools to solve the problem were not known to physicists at that time and eventually the problem was left unsolved.

III. OVERVIEW OF THE RECENT TOPOLOGICAL RESULTS

The interest in this problem revived in 1982 when S.P. Novikov found out that it was a perfectly suited




FIG. 3: FS with rank 3 (a), 2 (b), 1 (c) and 0 (d).

case where to apply his newly introduced Morse-Novikov theory²², namely the study of the topology of level surfaces of multivalued functions.

Fundamental results were found in Eighties and Nineties by his pupils A.V. Zorich and I.A. Dynnikov and from them Novikov later extracted the following picture: once a “complicated enough” Fermi Function is given (we will clarify this concept below), a fractal is determined on the set of the stereographic projections of the magnetic field directions; the fractal consists of smooth polygons (islands, or “stability zones”) that contain all possible lattice directions and generically meet each other in a finite number of points; every such polygon is labeled by a Miller index $\mathbf{L}$ and moreover to every magnetic field direction are associated two values of the energy $e_{m,M}(\mathbf{H})$.

The meaning of this picture is the following. Let $\mathcal{E}$ and E_F be the Fermi Function and Fermi Energy of a metal and suppose that we want to know the asymptotic behavior of trajectories of quasi-momenta for some magnetic field $\mathbf{H}$ whose stereographic projection lies inside a polygon labeled by the Miller index $\mathbf{L}$: the answer is that if E_F lies between $e_m(\mathbf{H})$ and $e_M(\mathbf{H})$ then open orbits exist and moreover they are all finite deformations of a straight line with direction $\mathbf{H} \times \mathbf{L}$; if E_F is instead smaller than e_m or bigger than e_M then all orbits are closed.

The directions for which $e_m(\mathbf{H}) = e_M(\mathbf{H})$ are non-generic and Novikov conjectured that they form a set of measure zero in the disc. The orbits of quasi-momenta induced by magnetic fields with those directions are much more complicated than the generic ones and for each such fixed direction there is only one energy value for which open orbits appear, while at every other energy all orbits are closed. Nevertheless this case may be relevant since it may explain deviations from the quadratic growth law detected in several metals for special directions of the magnetic field and it is currently under investigation by Novikov himself and Ya. Maltsev³¹.

Below we review in some detail the topological ideas on which the method is based. The first important fact is that³⁵ every FS is topologically equivalent to a sphere

with some finite number of handles attached (such number is called the *genus* of the FS). It is an intuitive fact that we need a genus bigger than zero to have an open FS, but this condition is not sufficient: it is enough to think to a sphere in the center of the first Brillouin zone and to add to it handles without ever touching the boundary of the zone.

The concept that detects whether a FS is open or not is its *topological rank*, namely the complement to three of the biggest number of “linearly independent” pairs of planes (i.e. planes whose perpendiculars are linearly independent) that can enclose the FS. Examples of FS of rank from three to zero are shown in fig.3: for example a sphere can be enclosed between three linearly independent pairs of planes, while a cylinder can be enclosed only between at most two of such pairs and so on. The case of interest for the phenomenon in study is the rank-3 one, since in the other ones either all orbits are closed (rank zero) or generically closed (rank one) or open but with an obvious asymptotic direction (rank two).

Despite its triviality, genus-2 rank-2 case turns out to be paradigmatic and it is worth describing it in detail. Examples of such surface are shown in fig.7, 3(b),4, namely a pair of parallel rectangles joined by a cylinder (incidentally, this is exactly the topology of the FS of Tin). The normal to the rectangles is a lattice direction that we will call $\mathbf{L}$.

Suppose first that $\mathbf{H}$ induces closed orbits on the cylinder (as in fig.4): then $\mathbf{H}$ induces also open orbits, since any orbit that does not lie entirely on the cylinder will be bound to stay on only one of the two plane sheets and therefore will be open (it has no way to turn back). Moreover, the surface is clearly enclosed between a pair of parallel lattice planes and therefore the orbits lie entirely in a finite width strip and, as Dynnikov²⁵ showed, pass through it; the Miller index common to the two lattice planes is clearly $\mathbf{L}$ and it is the quantum invariant associated to $\mathbf{H}$. Suppose now that there exist a plane perpendicular to $\mathbf{H}$ that intersects both bases of the cylinder, so that no closed orbit is cut on the cylinder by any plane parallel to it: then, assuming $\mathbf{H}$ fully irrational to simplify the discussion, every orbit will be closed. Indeed take any point on the FS and follow its




FIG. 4: A genus-2 rank-2 surface. For this choice of $\mathbf{H}$ closed loops are cut on the cylinder and therefore the critical saddles through p_1 and p_2 are half-opened (fig.6(ii)) and open orbits arise




FIG. 5: (a) Generic picture in case open orbits exist (here $g = 8$); (b) warped plane filled by open orbits (the two discs shown are bases for two cylinders of closed orbits³¹ (not shown in fig.)

orbit in one of the directions: since $\mathbf{H}$ is fully irrational, at a certain point the plane generating the orbit will cut a copy of the cylinder (in the extended zone picture) on both bases, i.e. the orbit will turn back; since exactly the same happens in the other direction, the orbit is closed.

Our analysis shows that the SM corresponding to such a FS, as it has been obtained experimentally for TiIn ⁶, contains a single island, whose boundary is given by the set of directions of planes that are tangent to both bases in diametrically opposite points. For example, if the topological cylinder is actually a right circular cylinder of radius r and height h , the island is a circle with center in the $\mathbf{L}$ direction and radius h/r . The Miller index associated to this island is of course the same $\mathbf{L}$ above and the direction of open orbits is given by the vector product $\mathbf{L} \times \mathbf{H}$.

Let us come now to the rank-3 case. A fundamental result by Zorich²⁴ is that, no matter how complicated the FS is, the one above is the generic behaviour for all directions “close enough” to rational, namely the open orbits, when they arise, lie on components of the FS that are exactly “warped planes” separated by cylinders of closed orbits. For each fixed direction, all such planes are parallel to each other and are in even number. The number of pairs is bound from above by $g/2$, where g is the genus of the surface; the number of cylinders is bounded from below by $g - 1$ (see fig.5). The difference with the rank-2 case is that now the surface may be split in many different ways in “warped planes” and cylinders (even in infinitely many ways in special cases), so that more than one zone can appear (possibly each one with a different Miller index).

The key-point here is the strong constraint determined by periodicity to the type of critical point that can be met in the sections of the FS by planes. Consider the simple case of $\mathbf{H} = (0, 0, 1)$: assuming that there are open orbits and that we are not in a degenerate case, all critical points will appear at different levels and they will be of one of the types shown in fig.6; since we are interested in open orbits, case (iii) is irrelevant for us and case (iv) is forbidden by the boundary conditions. Let us now follow one of the open orbits: if it never meets

any other curve, then after a period it meets itself again, meaning that the whole FS is just a single warped plane and everything is trivial (it is a genus-1 surface with rank 1 or 2); if it meets another orbit, then either it will be another open orbit (case (i)) and the two will annihilate each other (or, from another point of view, the open orbit will hit a closed one and bounce back), or it will be a closed orbit (case (ii)) and so the open one will simply engulf it and go on till it will meet again itself. There are only two possible outcomes for this process: either a warped cylinder (genus-1, rank-1) or a warped plane (genus-1, rank-2), in each case with some finite number of plane holes that are the basis of the cylinders of closed orbits that separate them from each other (see fig.5).

The reasonment above holds for any $\mathbf{H}$ pointing to a lattice direction, since we can bring every such $\mathbf{H}$ to $(0, 0, 1)$ with a coordinate change that leaves the lattice invariant, but it is impossible to extend it to the case of “irrational” $\mathbf{H}$ (i.e. not directed along a lattice di-




FIG. 6: Possible kind of open saddles for rational $\mathbf{H}$: (i) Fully open; (ii) Half-open; (iii) Fully closed; (iv) Fully open (impossible because of the boundary conditions). Only (ii) plays a role in the generic case since (i) arises only for rational directions of $\mathbf{H}$.




FIG. 7: Possible choice of canonical loops in a genus-2 surface. Any other non-trivial loop (i.e. a loop that cannot be continuously shrunk to a point) drawn on the surface cuts at least one of the base loops, i.e. it is “linearly dependent” by them.

rections), since in that case the orbits are not periodic anymore. Nevertheless, continuity helps us there: indeed the heights of the cylinders of closed orbits depend (at least) continuously on the direction $\mathbf{H}$ and therefore the cylinders will survive small perturbations and open orbits will still appear and will be bound to lie on small deformations of the same warped planes.

The Zorich observation reveals the existence of a quantum invariant of the system that had previously been missed and, at the same time, explains why magnetic field directions in SM are sorted in islands: small deformations of warped planes preserve open orbits and lead to the same Miller index $\mathbf{L}$, so there is a whole island around each rational $\mathbf{H}$ giving rise to open orbits and the same $\mathbf{L}$ is associated to all directions inside the island. From the construction it is clear that the open orbits have direction given by $\mathbf{H} \times \mathbf{L}$, so that experimentally it is enough to determine the direction of open orbits for two directions of the island to determine uniquely $\mathbf{L}$.

This discovery though does not solve completely the problem, since the set of directions “close enough” to all rational directions may not, in principle, cover the whole the disc. In Nineties I. Dynnikov showed²⁷ that the Zorich picture does represent the generic behaviour of the system in the following sense: given a Fermi Function $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{p})$ and a direction $\mathbf{H}$, open orbits arise only for a closed interval of energies $[e_m(\mathbf{H}), e_M(\mathbf{H})]$ and the structure of open orbits is the one described above when $e_m(\mathbf{H}) = e_M(\mathbf{H})$; in particular this means that, for every possible direction of $\mathbf{H}$, there is at least one value e of the energy such that $\mathbf{H}$ induces open orbits on $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{p}) = e$.

Dynnikov’s results also lead to a conclusion rather interesting and unexpected: SM taken at different energies are compatible (i.e. no more than one $\mathbf{L}$ is associated to every $\mathbf{H}$) and when we plot them all at the same time, building some kind of “all energies” SM, there are only two possible cases: either just one zone is present⁴¹, and that zone fills the whole disc, or infinitely many zones appear, distributed in a fractal-like way (see fig.9). Even though we cannot freely change the Fermi Energy of a metal, these fractals may in principle play a role in Physics because, for some special class of functions, there is an energy level at which the standard SM coincides exactly with the “global SM” (an example is provided in

sec.V).

IV. THE METHOD

The topological picture discovered by Zorich makes relatively simple to build an algorithm able to reconstruct the magnetoresistance map from any given FS.

Indeed, from what we said in the section above, it is clear that to investigate the topology of the orbits there is no need to study their asymptotics but rather it is enough to evaluate the Miller index associated to every magnetic field direction. Moreover, because of the Zorich result, it is enough to study what happens in the case of rational directions; this changes *qualitatively* the nature of the numerical problem we have to deal with, since the FS sections by a Miller plane are *periodic* and therefore, in principle, the *whole* orbits can be numerically evaluated with the desired precision.

To evaluate the Miller index we need to use elementary homology properties of loops on surfaces. It is a well known fact in topology that the algebraic sum of the intersections between two loops (*intersection number*) on closed compact surfaces is a homology invariant, i.e. it does not change if a loop is deformed with continuity or if it is replaced with one that forms with it the boundary of some surface. Moreover, if we agree to consider as the same loop all loops that are homologous to each other, we can give a $\mathbb{Z}$ -linear structure to this set that turns out to be isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}^{2g}$, i.e. it is (freely) generated by $2g$ (classes of) loops (see fig.7). In this setting, the intersection number becomes a bilinear antisymmetric non-degenerate form $\langle, \rangle$, namely a symplectic structure on $\mathbb{Z}^{2g}$, and in any canonical base $(\alpha_i, \beta_j)_{i,j=1,\dots,g}$ we have that

$$\langle \alpha_i, \beta_j \rangle = 1, \quad \langle \alpha_i, \alpha_j \rangle = \langle \beta_i, \beta_j \rangle = 0.$$

The key observation is that the loops that lie on the “warped planes” of open orbits have all intersection number zero with the closed loops living on the cylinders, since in that case there is no intersection at all. To evaluate the desired Miller index therefore it is enough to find out the homology classes of all loops that have zero intersection number with the loops that form the closed cylinder and finally find out the lattice direction that these loops have in the reciprocal lattice Γ^* : since all of them lie on “warped planes” homologous to the same lattice plane, the result will be a two-dimensional sublattice of Γ^* that will automatically give the Miller index we looked for.

We implemented this method in the following way: once a FS M and a direction $\mathbf{H}$ are given, first of all we identify somehow a base (better if canonical) for the homology loops on M and provide methods to evaluate the intersection number with respect to them; then we determine all saddle points of type (i) and (ii) that $\mathbf{H}$ induces on M and evaluate the intersection number of the closed loops of each of these saddles with all loops of




FIG. 8: (a) Rough sketch of the stability zones for a genus-3 surface²; (b) Example of section of a genus-3 surface; (c) Component of the “prison bars” surface; (d) Basic component of the “prison bars” surface with basic cycles shown on it (each repeated twice).

the base above. Once all these data have been collected (and after many compatibility checks have been made) we identify the space of non-trivial loops that do not intersect them, namely we find a base for the space of all loops of M that lie on the warped planes⁴². Finally, we evaluate the directions of those loops in the reciprocal lattice Γ^* , that will give us a set of directions identifying a 2-dimensional sublattice of Γ^* that in turn will give us the desired Miller index.

Our software core is a C++ library called NTC (Novikov Torus Conjecture) built over the graphics library VTK³⁶ that provides the basic calls to build iso-surfaces meshes and perform elementary geometric and topological operations. What our library adds to VTK is mainly the capability of dealing with “periodic geometry” and critical slices (e.g. planes that cut a surfaces in a saddle point) and the capability of evaluating topological quantities like homology classes of loops.

The library has been released under the GPL license and it is downloadable at the address <http://ntc.sf.net/>.

V. A TOY MODEL

It is well known³⁰ that a first rough expression for topologically non-trivial FS can be quickly obtained through the *tight-binding* approximation.

For a simple cubic crystal this approximation leads in




FIG. 9: (a) SM for $\mathcal{E} = \cos(2\pi p_x) + \cos(2\pi p_y) + \cos(2\pi p_z)$; (b) detail of the fractal in coordinates $(H_x, H_y, 1)$; (c) boundaries and Miller indexes of a few stability zones evaluated analytically; (d) comparison between numerical and analytical calculations.

the lowest order to the following FF³⁷:

$$\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{p}) = \cos(2\pi p_x) + \cos(2\pi p_y) + \cos(2\pi p_z).$$

It turns out that this FF is the simplest non-trivial case for our system: indeed its level surfaces are either spheres, when $E < -1$ or $E > 1$, or genus-3 rank-3 surfaces shaped as a sort of “three-dimensional prison bars” (fig. 8).

Several efforts have been made in Sixties to understand the topology of orbits in this elementary case, but the production of SM did not get more detail than the rough sketch shown in fig.8(a).

This function is a perfect “toy-model” for testing our algorithm since its analytical expression is so simple to make possible verifying many things analytically. Moreover, it satisfies the following property: its level surfaces $\{\mathcal{E} = c\}$ and $\{\mathcal{E} = -c\}$ differ only by a translation, so that a magnetic field $\mathbf{H}$ that gives rise to open orbits at energy c does the same at the opposite energy, i.e. all energy intervals giving rise to open orbits have the form $[-e(\mathbf{H}), e(\mathbf{H})]$; open orbits therefore arise for every direction of $\mathbf{H}$ at the level $e = 0$, namely the SM at the zero level is identical to the “global SM”. It is easy to verify (even by hand!) that this SM has more than a zone and therefore (sec.III) it has infinitely many zones distributed in a fractal-like way. Finally, at the zero-energy level it is possible to get a simple analytical expression for the saddle points as function of the magnetic field direction, an information that is enough to obtain, in principle, the analytical expression of the boundary for any island.

Biggest zones in the SM for $\mathcal{E} = \cos(p_x) + \cos(p_y) + \cos(p_z)$			
Miller index	Area	Miller index	Area
(0, 0, 1)	$(2.83 \pm .02)10^{-1}$	(1, 5, 5)	$(4.1 \pm .2)10^{-3}$
(1, 1, 1)	$(2.03 \pm .01)10^{-1}$	(2, 5, 8)	$(4.1 \pm .4)10^{-3}$
(1, 2, 2)	$(8.2 \pm .2)10^{-2}$	(2, 6, 7)	$(3.4 \pm .4)10^{-3}$
(0, 1, 2)	$(5.1 \pm .1)10^{-2}$	(4, 7, 8)	$(3.0 \pm .3)10^{-3}$
(1, 3, 3)	$(2.1 \pm .1)10^{-2}$	(0, 3, 4)	$(2.9 \pm .4)10^{-3}$
(2, 3, 4)	$(1.7 \pm .1)10^{-2}$	(3, 5, 7)	$(2.7 \pm .3)10^{-3}$
(1, 3, 5)	$(9.6 \pm .5)10^{-3}$	(1, 6, 6)	$(2.0 \pm .1)10^{-3}$
(1, 4, 6)	$(9.6 \pm .5)10^{-3}$	(4, 5, 8)	$(2.0 \pm .4)10^{-3}$
(0, 2, 3)	$(9.0 \pm .6)10^{-3}$	(5, 8, 10)	$(1.9 \pm .4)10^{-3}$
(2, 4, 5)	$(8.6 \pm .6)10^{-3}$	(4, 6, 9)	$(1.8 \pm .3)10^{-3}$
(1, 4, 4)	$(8.3 \pm .3)10^{-3}$	(1, 6, 10)	$(1.7 \pm .1)10^{-3}$
(1, 2, 4)	$(6.2 \pm .5)10^{-3}$	(5, 9, 11)	$(1.6 \pm .2)10^{-3}$
(3, 4, 6)	$(4.7 \pm .5)10^{-3}$	(4, 6, 7)	$(1.5 \pm .2)10^{-3}$

FIG. 10: Miller indices associated to the biggest zones of the SM in the unitary square (fig.9).

We produced the SM in the square $0 \leq H_{x,y} \leq 1$, $H_z = 1$ by evaluating the Miller index associated to every direction in a $10^3 \times 10^3$ equally spaced square lattice (fig.9(b)) and then obtained the whole SM by symmetry (fig.9(a)). In fig.9(c) are shown the boundaries of the biggest zones obtained directly from the analytical expression of the saddle points; as it is possible to verify from fig.9(d), there is a perfect agreement between numerical and analytical data. Similar calculations made for a piecewise smooth quadratic function with the same symmetries of $\mathcal{E}$ showed a similar agreement even at energies different from zero.

Finally, in fig.10 we list the Miller indices corresponding to the biggest 26 zones together with an estimate of their area in the unitary square. A thorough description of the study of this FS can be found in [DL03]³⁸.

VI. NUMERICAL EXPLORATION FOR GOLD AND SILVER

It is a well-established result that Gold and Silver have a genus-4 FS: both FS are spheres with four handles directed along the four diagonals of the cube (e.g. see fig.11(a)).

Extremely precise estimates of the FF values can now be achieved through numerical calculations, for example using advanced tight-binding methods³⁹, but several facts lead us to use older estimates in form of analytical approximations: on one hand, Gaidukov experiments were conducted with a magnetic field intensity of $H \simeq 1T$, barely around the minimum intensity for the FS topology to be relevant, so that a priori we cannot expect more than a rough agreement with the experimental data; on the other hand, dealing with FF known only numerically would make so complicated and slow our algorithm that it would make sense doing it only once it is clear that the algorithm works properly. Since




FIG. 11: (a) FS of Au according to the Halse formula; (b) numerical SM of Au in the unit square in coordinates $(H_x, H_y, 1)$ obtained using the NTC library; (c) experimental SM for Au obtained experimentally by Gaidukov³; (d) numerical SM for Au obtained from (b) by symmetry.

the numerical results proved to be very encouraging, we are currently working on adding to our algorithm the possibility to work on FF provided in numerical form and it is our hope that, now that numerical algorithms exist to compare theoretical predictions and experimental results, new experiments will be made with stronger magnetic fields to allow detailed comparisons.

Very precise analytical approximations for the FF of Au, Ag and Cu have been known since late Fifties; we extracted the ones we used from Halse's formulas⁴⁰ that are known to give rise to surfaces within .2% from the actual Fermi Surface:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(p) = & 3 - \sum \cos(2\pi p_x) \cos(2\pi p_y) \\ & + \alpha (3 - \sum \cos(4\pi p_x)) \\ & + \beta (3 - \sum \cos(4\pi p_x) \cos(2\pi p_y) \cos(2\pi p_z)) \\ & + \gamma (3 - \sum \cos(4\pi p_x) \cos(4\pi p_y)) \\ & + \delta (6 - \sum (\cos(6\pi p_x) \cos(2\pi p_y) - \cos(2\pi p_x) \cos(6\pi p_y))) \end{aligned}$$

	α	β	γ	δ	E_F
Cu	.00693	-.42501	-.01679	-.03772	1.69167
Ag	-.12030	-.90187	-.14086	-.09483	-0.89789
Au	-.16635	-1.25516	-.09914	-.12704	-2.26213

Since FS have genus four, in the first Brillouin zone there can be at most three cylinders of closed orbits and therefore no more than a pair of “warped planes”, like in the




FIG. 12: (a) FS of Ag according to the Halse formula; (b) numerical SM of Ag in the unit square in coordinates $(H_x, H_y, 1)$ obtained using the NTC library; (c) experimental SM for Ag obtained experimentally by Gaidukov and Alekseevskii⁴; (d) numerical SM for Ag obtained from (b) by symmetry.

genus-3 case, but this time there are six (rather than four) basic cycles. Exactly like in the “prison bars” case, the symmetries of the FS are such to allow to restrict the numerical exploration to half of the square $[0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ representing the directions $\mathbf{H} = (H_x, H_y, 1)$. We performed numerical simulations for Gold and Silver sampling the unit square with a lattice of 100×100 points. The resolution we used for generating a simplicial decomposition of the Fermi Surface was again a 100×100 lattice in the cube. The symmetry of the picture with respect to the diagonal of the first quadrant is a useful extra check about the correctness of the output we get.

The biggest four zones have been found in both Gold and Silver and are labeled exactly by the direction at their centers, namely $(0, 0, 1)$, $(1, 0, 1)$, $(0, 1, 1)$ and $(1, 1, 1)$ (as it had to be according to Dynnikov²⁷).

A fifth zone labeled by $(3, 3, 4)$ has been found in Gold only; it does not contain the direction with its label and is the only one that has not been detected in Gaidukov’s

experiment. Since this zone is very small it is not clear whether it has not been seen because of the limits of the semiclassical approximation or of the low intensity of the magnetic field used in Sixties by Gaidukov. New experimental data taken with a stronger magnetic field should be able to answer this question. In fig.11(d) and 12(d) we extend by symmetry those data and show the resulting stereographic projection comparing it with the ones generated by Gaidukov from its experimental data. In both cases the pictures are in very good agreement.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

The method described in this paper allows, for the first time, to predict the Stereographic Map of a metal from the knowledge of its Fermi Surface.

Applying this method we first verified, with a toy model, Dynnikov’s discovery of the fractal structures of “global SM” and then produced SM for Au and Ag based on analytical expressions for their FS available in literature. The zones found numerically for the toy model agree perfectly with the corresponding boundaries found analytically; the ones found for Au and Ag are very close to the corresponding experimental data, that is even more remarkable considering that those data, obtained more than forty years ago, were taken just at the lower threshold for the semiclassical approximation to hold.

A new zone, not detected experimentally, was found in Au. It is not clear whether this is only due to inaccuracies in the FS utilized in calculations or rather to the too weak magnetic field used in the Gaidukov experiment or possibly to purely quantum mechanical corrections to the semiclassical approximation. It is our hope new accurate Stereographic Maps for Au will be produced to help finding out the right answer.

VIII. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We wish to thank S.P. Novikov for introducing the subject and precious scientific discussions. We also thank I. Dynnikov for suggesting the method we implemented and for stimulating discussions that were essential for the present work, I. Mazin for his scientific help and advice and P. Ruggerone for critically reading this work. All numerical calculations were made with computers kindly provided by INFN (www.ca.infn.it) and IPST (www.ipst.umd.edu). We also acknowledge financial support from Indam (indam.mat.uniroma1.it).

* Electronic address: roberto.deleo@ca.infn.it; Also at Physics Department, University of Cagliari, Italy

¹ E. Justi and H. Scheffers, Phys. Z. **38**, 891 (1937).

² I. Lifschitz, M. Azbel, and M. Kaganov, JETP **3**, 143

- (1956).
- ³ Y. Gaidukov, JETP **10**, 913 (1960).
 - ⁴ N. Alexeevskii and Y. Gaidukov, JETP **15**, 49 (1962).
 - ⁵ N. Alexeevskii and Y. Gaidukov, JETP **9**, 311 (1959).
 - ⁶ N. Alexeevskii, Y. Gaidukov, I. Lifschitz, and V. Peschanskii, JETP **12**, 837 (1961).
 - ⁷ N. Alexeevskii and Y. Gaidukov, JETP **10**, 481 (1960).
 - ⁸ N. Alexeevskii and Y. Gaidukov, JETP **14**, 256 (1962).
 - ⁹ N. Alexeevskii and Y. Gaidukov, JETP **14**, 770 (1962).
 - ¹⁰ N. Alexeevskii and Y. Gaidukov, JETP **16**, 1481 (1963).
 - ¹¹ N. Alexeevskii, E. Karstens, and V. Mozhaev, JETP **19**, 1979 (1964).
 - ¹² A. Pippard, Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. A **250**, 325 (1957).
 - ¹³ I. Lifschitz, M. Azbel, and M. Kaganov, JETP **4**, 41 (1957).
 - ¹⁴ I. Lifschitz, M. Azbel, and M. Kaganov, *Electron theory of metals* (Consultants Bureau, 1973).
 - ¹⁵ I. Lifschitz and V. Peschanskii, JETP **8**, 875 (1959).
 - ¹⁶ I. Lifschitz and V. Peschanskii, JETP **11**, 137 (1960).
 - ¹⁷ R. Chambers, in *Magnetoresistance*, edited by Harrison and Webb (1960).
 - ¹⁸ R. Chambers, Proc. Roy. Soc. **238**, 344 (1957).
 - ¹⁹ D. Shoenberg, Proc. Mag. **5**, 105 (1960).
 - ²⁰ D. Shoenberg, Proc. Trans. Roy. Soc. A **255**, 85 (1962).
 - ²¹ A. Pippard, *Magnetoresistance in Metals* (CUP, 1989).
 - ²² S. Novikov, Usp. Mat. Nauk (RMS) **37:5**, 3 (1982).
 - ²³ S. Novikov and A. Maltsev, Usp. Fiz. Nauk **41:3**, 231 (1998).
 - ²⁴ A. Zorich, Usp. Mat. Nauk (RMS) **39:5**, 235 (1984).
 - ²⁵ I. Dynnikov, Usp. Mat. Nauk (RMS) **57:3**, 172 (1992).
 - ²⁶ I. Dynnikov, AMS Transl **179**, 45 (1997).
 - ²⁷ I. Dynnikov, RMS **54:1**, 21 (1999).
 - ²⁸ P. Kapitza, Proc. Roy. Soc. **125A**, 292 (1929).
 - ²⁹ R. Peierls, Ann. Phys. **10**, 193 (1931).
 - ³⁰ N. Ashcroft and N. Mermin, *Solid State Physics* (North Holland, 1976).
 - ³¹ S. Novikov and A. Maltsev, J. of Statistical Physics **115**, 31 (2003), cond-mat/0312708.
 - ³² I. Lifschitz and A. Kaganov, in *The Fermi Surface*, edited by M. SpringFord (CUP, 1980).
 - ³³ A. Abrikosov, *Fundamentals of the Theory of Metals* (North Holland, 1988).
 - ³⁴ I. Lifschitz and A. Kaganov, Soviet Physics **2**, 831 (1960).
 - ³⁵ S. Novikov, B. Dubrovin, and A. Fomenko, *Modern Geometry III* (Springer Verlag, 1989).
 - ³⁶ W. Schroeder, K. Martin, and B. Lorentz, *The Visualization Toolkit* (Prentice Hall PTR, 1998).
 - ³⁷ A. Davydov, *Théorie du solide* (MIR, 1984).
 - ³⁸ R. D. Leo, SIADS **2:4**, 517 (2003), URL <http://epubs.siam.org/sam-bin/dbq/article/40664>.
 - ³⁹ D. Papaconstantopoulos and M. Mehl, Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter **15**, 413 (2003).
 - ⁴⁰ M. Halse, Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. London A **265**, 507 (1969).
 - ⁴¹ e.g. this happens for FF whose level sets are only spheres and Tin-like surfaces
 - ⁴² they are closed loops on M when we look at them in the reduced zone scheme but, once seen in the repeated zone scheme, they are open