

Quasiparticles and order parameter near quantum phase transition in heavy fermion metals

V.R. Shaginyan ^{*,1,2} A.Z. Msezane,² and M.Ya. Amusia^{3,4}

¹*Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute, Russian Academy of Sciences, Gatchina, 188300, Russia*

²*CTSPS, Clark Atlanta University, Atlanta, Georgia 30314, USA*

³*Racah Institute of Physics, the Hebrew University, Jerusalem 91904, Israel*

⁴*A.F. Ioffe Physical-Technical Institute,
Russian Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg, 194021, Russia*

Abstract

It is shown that the Landau paradigm based upon both the quasiparticle concept and the notion of the order parameter is valid and can be used to explain the anomalous behavior of the heavy fermion metals near quantum critical points. The understanding of this phenomenon has been problematic largely because of the absence of theoretical guidance. Exploiting this paradigm and the fermion condensation quantum phase transition, we investigate the anomalous behavior of the heavy electron liquid near its critical point at different temperatures and applied magnetic fields. We show that this anomalous behavior is universal and can be used to capture the essential aspects of recent experiments on heavy-fermion metals at low temperatures.

PACS numbers: 71.10.Hf; 71.27.+a; 75.30.Cr

Keywords: Quantum phase transitions; Heavy fermions; Quasiparticles

* E-mail: vrshag@thd.pnpi.spb.ru

Recent experiments have demonstrated that at low temperatures the main properties of the heavy-fermion (HF) metals such as the magnetoresistance, resistivity, specific heat, magnetization, susceptibility, volume thermal expansion, etc, strongly depend on temperature T and applied magnetic field B . As a result, these properties can be controlled by placing these metals at the special point of the field-temperature $B - T$ phase diagram. In the Landau Fermi liquid (LFL) theory, considered as the main instrument when investigating quantum many electron physics, the effective mass M^* of quasiparticle excitations determining the thermodynamic properties of electronic systems is practically independent of the temperature and applied magnetic fields. Therefore, the observed anomalous behavior is uncommon and can be hardly understood within the framework of the LFL theory. Consequently, it is theories necessary to invoke that are based on the Landau concept of the order parameter which is introduced to classify phases of matter. These theories associate the anomalous behavior with critical fluctuations of the magnetic order parameter. These fluctuations suppressing the quasiparticles are attributed to a conventional quantum phase transition taking place when the system in question approaches its quantum critical point (QCP). It has become generally accepted that the fundamental physics that gives rise to the high- T_c superconductivity and non-Fermi liquid (NFL) behavior, with the recovery of the Landau-Fermi liquid (LFL) behavior under the application of magnetic fields observed in the HF metals and high- T_c compounds, is controlled by quantum phase transitions. This has made quantum phase transitions a subject of intense current interest, see e.g. [1, 2].

A quantum phase transition is driven by control parameters such as composition, pressure, number density x of electrons (holes), magnetic field B , etc, and takes place at QCP when the temperature $T = 0$. QCP separates an ordered phase generated by quantum phase transition from a disordered phase. It is expected that the universal behavior is only observable if the heavy electron liquid in question is very near QCP, for example, when the correlation length is much larger than the microscopic length scales. Quantum phase transitions of this type are quite common, and we shall label them as conventional quantum phase transitions (CQPT). In the case of CQPT, the physics is dominated by thermal and quantum fluctuations of the critical state, which is characterized by the absence of quasiparticles. It is believed that the absence of quasiparticle-like excitations is the main cause of the NFL behavior and other types of the critical behavior in the quantum critical region. However, theories based on CQPT fail to explain the experimental observations related to the divergence of the effective mass M^* at the magnetic field tuned QCP, the specific behavior of the spin susceptibility and its scaling properties, the thermal expansion behavior, etc, see e.g.

[3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17].

The LFL theory rests on the notion of quasiparticles which represent elementary excitations of a Fermi liquid. Therefore these are appropriate excitations to describe the low temperature thermodynamic properties. In the case of an electron system, these are characterized by the electron's quantum numbers and effective mass M^* independent of the temperature and magnetic field. The inability of the LFL theory to explain the experimental observations which point to the dependence of M^* on the temperature T and applied magnetic field B may lead to the conclusion that the quasiparticles do not survive near QCP, and one might be further led to the conclusion that the heavy electron does not retain its integrity as a quasiparticle excitation, see e.g. [8, 14, 15, 16].

The mentioned above inability to explain the behavior of the HF metals at QCP within the framework of theories based on CQPT may also lead to the conclusion that the other important Landau concept of the order parameter fails as well, see e.g. [14, 15, 16]. Thus, we are left without the most fundamental principles of many body quantum physics while a great deal of interesting NFL phenomena related to the anomalous behavior and the experimental facts collected in measurements on the HF metals remain out of reasonable theoretical explanations.

In this Letter we show that the Landau paradigm resting upon both the quasiparticle concept and the notion of the order parameter are valid and can be used to explain the anomalous behavior of the HF metals near QCP. Exploiting this paradigm, we identify QCP observed in the HF metals as the QCP corresponding to the fermion condensation quantum phase transition (FCQPT) and consider the behavior of the quasiparticle effective mass $M^*(T, B)$ as a function of temperature T , applied magnetic field B and the number density x . This behavior is universal and can be used to explain the main properties of the HF metals at low temperatures such as the magnetoresistance, resistivity, specific heat, magnetization, volume thermal expansion, etc. We also demonstrate that the theory captures the essential aspects of recent experiments in the HF metals at low temperatures.

Assuming the existence of quasiparticles, we start with the Landau equation determining $M^*(T, B)$ in the case of a homogeneous liquid at finite temperatures and low magnetic field, see e.g. [18]

$$\frac{1}{M^*(T, B)} = \frac{1}{M} + \sum_{\sigma_1} \int \frac{\mathbf{p}_F \mathbf{p}_1}{p_F^3} F_{\sigma, \sigma_1}(\mathbf{p}_F, \mathbf{p}_1) \frac{\partial n_{\sigma_1}(\mathbf{p}_1, T, B)}{\partial p_1} \frac{d\mathbf{p}_1}{(2\pi)^3}. \quad (1)$$

Here $F_{\sigma, \sigma_1}(\mathbf{p}_F, \mathbf{p}_1)$ is the Landau amplitude depending on the momenta p and spins σ , p_F is the Fermi momentum, M is the bare mass of an electron and $n_{\sigma}(\mathbf{p}, T)$ is the quasiparticle distribution function. Since HF metals are predominantly three dimensional (3D) structures we treat the homogeneous heavy electron liquid as a 3D liquid also. For the sake of simplicity, we omit the spin dependence

of the effective mass since in the case of a homogeneous liquid and weak magnetic fields, $M^*(T, B)$ does not noticeably depend on the spins. The quasiparticle distribution function is of the form

$$n_\sigma(\mathbf{p}, T) = \left\{ 1 + \exp \left[\frac{(\varepsilon(\mathbf{p}, T) - \mu_\sigma)}{T} \right] \right\}^{-1}, \quad (2)$$

where $\varepsilon(\mathbf{p}, T)$ is the single-particle spectrum, or dispersion, of the quasiparticle excitations and μ_σ is the chemical potential. The single-particle spectrum is given by the equation [18]

$$\varepsilon(\mathbf{p}, T) = \frac{\delta E[n(p)]}{\delta n(\mathbf{p}, T)}, \quad (3)$$

where $E[n(p)]$ is the Landau functional defining the ground state energy E . In our case, the single-particle spectrum does not noticeably depend on the spin, while the chemical potential may have a dependence due to the Zeeman splitting. We will show explicitly the spin dependence of a physical value when this dependence is of importance for understanding. Since $\varepsilon(p \sim p_F, T) - \mu \sim p_F(p - p_F)/M^*$, it follows from Eq. (2) that the quasiparticle distribution function becomes the step function of the momentum, $n(p, T = 0) = \theta(p_F - p)$, at zero temperature, provided that the effective mass is positive and finite. Applying Eq. (1) at $T = 0$ and $B = 0$ and taking into account that $n(p, T = 0)$ becomes the step function we obtain the standard result

$$\frac{M^*}{M} = \frac{1}{1 - N_0 F^1(p_F, p_F)/3}.$$

Here N_0 is the density of states of the free Fermi gas and $F^1(p_F, p_F)$ is the p -wave component of the Landau interaction. Since in the LFL theory $x = p_F^3/3\pi^2$, the Landau amplitude can be written as $F^1(p_F, p_F) = F^1(x)$. Assume that at some critical point x_{FC} the denominator $(1 - N_0 F^1(p_F, p_F)/3)$ tends to zero, that is $(1 - N_0 F^1(x)/3) \propto (x - x_{FC}) \rightarrow 0$. As a result, one obtains that $M^*(x)$ behaves as [19, 20]

$$\frac{M^*(x)}{M} \propto \frac{x_{FC}}{x - x_{FC}} \propto \frac{1}{r}. \quad (4)$$

Here $r = (x - x_{FC})$ is the “distance” from the QCP of FCQPT taking place at x_{FC} . The observed behavior is in good agreement with recent experimental observations, see e.g. [21, 22], and calculations [23, 24, 25]. In the case of electronic systems Eq. (4) is valid at low densities [26, 27]. Such a behavior of the effective mass can be observed in the HF metals with a quite flat, narrow conduction band, corresponding to a large effective mass $M^*(x \simeq x_{FC})$, with strong electron correlations and the effective Fermi temperature $T_k \sim p_F^2/M^*(x)$ of the order of a few Kelvin or even lower [28].

Replacing $n_\sigma(\mathbf{p}, T, B)$ by $n_\sigma(\mathbf{p}, T, B) \equiv \delta n_\sigma(\mathbf{p}, T, B) + n_\sigma(\mathbf{p}, T = 0, B = 0)$ where $\delta n_\sigma(\mathbf{p}, T, B) = n_\sigma(\mathbf{p}, T, B) - n_\sigma(\mathbf{p}, T = 0, B = 0)$, Eq. (1) takes the form

$$\frac{M}{M^*(T, B)} = \frac{M}{M^*(x)} + \frac{M}{p_F^2} \sum_{\sigma_1} \int \frac{\mathbf{p}_F \mathbf{p}_1}{p_F} F_{\sigma, \sigma_1}(\mathbf{p}_F, \mathbf{p}_1) \frac{\partial \delta n_{\sigma_1}(\mathbf{p}_1, T, B)}{\partial p_1} \frac{d\mathbf{p}_1}{(2\pi)^3}. \quad (5)$$

Note, that $M^*(x)$ is given by Eq. (4). In the case of normal metals with the effective mass of the order of a few bare electron masses and up to temperatures $T \sim 10$ K, the second term on the right hand side of Eq. (5) is of the order of T^2/μ^2 and is much smaller than the first term. Thus, the system in question demonstrates the LFL behavior with the effective mass being practically independent of temperature, that is the corrections are proportional to T^2 . One can check that the same is true when magnetic field up to $B \sim 10$ T is applied. Near the critical point x_{FC} , when $M/M^*(x \rightarrow x_{FC}) \rightarrow 0$, the behavior of the effective mass changes drastically because the first term vanishes and the second term determines the effective mass itself rather than small corrections to $M^*(x)$ related to T and B . In that case, Eq. (5) no longer explicitly depends on $M^*(x)$ and determine the effective mass as a function of B and T . As we will see, Eq. (5) describes both the NFL behavior and the LFL one with the presence of quasiparticles. In contrast to the conventional quasiparticles these are characterized by an effective mass that strongly depends on both the magnetic field and the temperature.

Let us turn to a qualitative analysis of the solutions of Eq. (5) when $x \simeq x_{FC}$. We start with the case when $T = 0$ and B is finite. The application of magnetic field leads to the Zeeman splitting of the Fermi surface and the difference δp between the Fermi surfaces with “spin up” and “spin down” becomes $\delta p = p_F^\uparrow - p_F^\downarrow \sim \mu_B B M^*(B)/p_F$ with μ_B being the Bohr magneton. Upon taking this into account, we observe that the second term in Eq. (5) is proportional to $(\delta p)^2 \propto (\mu_B B M^*(B)/p_F)^2$, and Eq. (5) takes the form

$$\frac{M}{M^*(B)} \simeq \frac{M}{M^*(x)} + c \frac{(\mu_B B M^*(B))^2}{p_F^4}, \quad (6)$$

where c is a constant. Note that the effective mass $M^*(B)$ depends on x as well and this dependence disappears at $x = x_{FC}$. At the point $x = x_{FC}$, the term $M/M^*(x)$ vanishes, Eq. (6) becomes uniform and can be solved analytically [19, 29]

$$\frac{M}{M^*(B)} \propto \frac{1}{(B - B_{c0})^{2/3}}. \quad (7)$$

Here, B_{c0} is the critical magnetic field which drives both a HF metal to its magnetic field tuned QCP and the corresponding Néel temperature toward $T = 0$ [30]. We note that in some cases $B_{c0} = 0$, for example, the HF metal CeRu₂Si₂ shows neither evidence of the magnetic ordering, superconductivity

down to the lowest temperatures nor the LFL behavior [6]. When deriving Eq. (6), we have omitted the next terms on the right hand side of Eq. (6) assuming that $(B\mu_B M/p_F^2) \ll 1$. At $x > x_{FC}$, $M^*(x)$ is finite and we are dealing with the conventional Landau quasiparticles provided that the magnetic field is weak, so that $M^*(x)/M^*(B) \ll 1$ with $M^*(B)$ is given by Eq. (7). In that case, the second term on the right hand side of Eq. (6) is proportional to $(BM^*(x))^2$ and represents small corrections. In the opposite case, when $M^*(x)/M^*(B) \gg 1$, the heavy electron liquid behaves as it were placed at QCP. Since in the LFL regime the main thermodynamic properties of the system is determined by the effective mass, it follows from Eq. (7) that we obtain a unique possibility to control the magnetoresistance, resistivity, specific heat, magnetization, volume thermal expansion, etc. At this point, we note that the large effective mass leads to the high density of states provoking a large number of states and phase transitions to emerge and compete with one another. Here we assume that these can be suppressed by the application of a magnetic field and concentrate on the thermodynamical properties.

To consider the qualitative behavior of $M^*(T)$ at elevated temperatures, we simplify Eq. (5) by omitting the variable B and mimicking the influence of the applied magnetic field by the finite effective mass entering the denominator of the first term on the right hand side of Eq. (5). This effective mass becomes a function of the distance r , $M^*(r)$, which is determined by both B and $(x - x_{FC})$. If the magnetic field vanishes the distance is $r = (x - x_{FC})$. We integrate the second term over the angle variable, then over p_1 by parts and substitute the variable p_1 by z , $z = (\varepsilon(p_1) - \mu)/T$. In the case of the flat and narrow band, we use an approximation $(\varepsilon(p_1) - \mu) \simeq p_F(p_1 - p_F)/M^*(T)$ and obtain

$$\frac{M}{M^*(T)} = \frac{M}{M^*(r)} + \alpha \int_0^\infty F(p_F, p_F(1 + \alpha z)) \frac{1}{1 + e^z} dz - \alpha \int_0^{1/\alpha} F(p_F, p_F(1 - \alpha z)) \frac{1}{1 + e^z} dz. \quad (8)$$

Here the function $F \sim Md(F^1 p^2)/dp$, the factor $\alpha = TM^*(T)/p_F^2 = TM^*(T)/(T_k M^*(r))$, and the Fermi momentum is defined as $\varepsilon(p_F) = \mu$. We first assume that $\alpha \ll 1$. Then omitting terms of the order of $\exp(-1/\alpha)$, we expand the upper limit of the second integral on the right hand side of Eq. (8) to ∞ and observe that the sum of the second and third terms represents an even function of α . These are the typical integrals containing the Fermi-Dirac function and can be calculated by using standard procedures, see e.g. [31]. Since we need only an estimation of the integrals, we represent Eq. (8) as

$$\frac{M}{M^*(T)} \simeq \frac{M}{M^*(r)} + a_1 \left(\frac{TM^*(T)}{T_k M^*(r)} \right)^2 + a_2 \left(\frac{TM^*(T)}{T_k M^*(r)} \right)^4 + \dots \quad (9)$$

Here a_1 and a_2 are constants of the order of units. Equation (9) can be regarded as a typical equation

of the LFL theory with the only exception being the effective mass $M^*(r)$ which strongly depends on the distance $r = x - x_{FC} \geq 0$ and diverges as $r \rightarrow 0$. Nonetheless, it follows from Eq. (9) that when $T \rightarrow 0$, the corrections to $M^*(r)$ start with the T^2 terms provided that

$$M/M^*(r) \gg \left(\frac{TM^*(T)}{T_k M^*(r)} \right)^2 \simeq \frac{T^2}{T_k^2}, \quad (10)$$

and the system exhibits the LFL behavior. It is seen from Eq. (10) that when $r \rightarrow 0$, $M^*(r) \rightarrow \infty$, and the LFL behavior expires. The free term on the right hand side of Eq. (8) vanishes, $M/M^*(r) \rightarrow 0$, and Eq. (8) in itself determines the value and universal behavior of the effective mass.

At some temperature $T_1 \ll T_k$, the value of the sum on the right hand side of Eq. (9) is determined by the second term. Then Eq. (10) is not valid, and upon keeping only the second term in Eq. (9) this can be used to determine $M^*(T)$ in a transition region [29, 32]

$$M^*(T) \propto \frac{1}{T^{2/3}}. \quad (11)$$

The evolution of the $-2/3$ exponent as the temperature increases is worth a comment. Equation (11) is valid if the second term in Eq. (9) is much larger than the first one, that is

$$\frac{T^2}{T_k^2} \gg \frac{M}{M^*(r)}, \quad (12)$$

and this term is greater than the third one,

$$\frac{T}{T_k} \ll \frac{M^*(r)}{M^*(T)} \simeq 1. \quad (13)$$

Obviously, both Eqs. (12) and (13) can be simultaneously satisfied if $M/M^*(r) \ll 1$ and T is finite. The range of temperatures over which Eq. (11) is valid shrinks to zero as soon as $r \rightarrow 0$ because $T_k \rightarrow 0$. Thus, if the system is very near QCP, $x \rightarrow x_{FC}$, it is possible to observe the behavior of the effective mass given by Eq. (11) in a wide range of temperatures provided that the effective mass $M^*(r)$ is diminished by the application of high magnetic fields, that is, the distance r becomes larger due to B . When r is finite the $T^{-2/3}$ behavior can be observed at relatively high temperatures. To estimate the transition temperature T_1 , we observe that the effective mass is a continuous function of the temperature, thus $M^*(B) \sim M^*(T_1)$. Taking into account Eqs. (7) and (11), we obtain $T_1 \propto B$.

Then, at elevated temperatures, the system enters into a different regime. The coefficient α becomes $\alpha \sim 1$, the upper limit of the second integral in Eq. (8) cannot be expanded to ∞ , and odd terms come into play. As a result, Eq. (9) is no longer valid, but the sum of both the first integral and the second one on the right hand side of Eq. (8) is proportional to $M^*(T)T$. Upon omitting the

first term $M/M^*(r)$ and approximating the sum of the integrals by $M^*(T)T$, we solve Eq. (8) and obtain

$$M^*(T) \propto \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}. \quad (14)$$

Thus, we can conclude that at elevated temperatures when $x \simeq x_{FC}$ the system exhibits three types of regimes: the LFL behavior at $\alpha \ll 1$, when Eq. (10) is valid; the $M^*(T) \propto T^{-2/3}$ behavior, when Eqs. (12) and (13) are valid; and the $1/\sqrt{T}$ behavior of the effective mass at $\alpha \sim 1$.

Since the resistivity, $\rho(T) = \rho_0 + \Delta\rho$, with ρ_0 being the residual resistivity and $\Delta\rho = A(B)T^2$, is directly determined by the effective mass because the coefficient $A(B) \propto (M^*)^2$ [33] the above mentioned regimes can be observed in measurements of the resistivity. The first LFL regime is related to Eq. (7) and represented by $\Delta\rho_1 = c_1 T^2 / (B - B_{c0})^{4/3} \propto T^2$; the second NFL one is determined by Eq. (11) and characterized by $\Delta\rho_2 = c_2 T^2 / (T^{2/3})^2 \propto T^{2/3}$; and the third NFL one is given by Eq. (14) and represented by $\Delta\rho_3 = c_3 T^2 / (\sqrt{T})^2 \propto T$. Here c_1, c_2, c_3 are constants. It is remarkable that all these regimes were observed in measurements on the HF metals [5, 9, 11, 13]. If we consider the ratio $\Delta\rho_2/\Delta\rho_1 \propto ((B - B_{c0})/T)^{4/3}$, we arrive at the very interesting conclusion that the ratio is a function of only the variable $(B - B_{c0})/T$ representing the scaling behavior. This result is in excellent agreement with experimental facts [11].

We now turn to the estimation of the quasiparticles width $\gamma(T)$. Within the framework of the LFL theory the width is given by [18]

$$\gamma \sim |\Gamma|^2 (M^*)^3 T^2, \quad (15)$$

where Γ is the particle-hole amplitude. In the case of a strongly correlated system with its large density of states related to the huge value of the effective mass, the amplitude Γ cannot be approximated by the bare particle interaction but can be estimated within the ladder approximation which gives $|\Gamma| \sim 1/(p_F M^*(T))$ [34]. As a result, we have that in the LFL regime $\gamma(T) \propto T^2$, in the $T^{-2/3}$ regime $\gamma(T) \propto T^{4/3}$, and in the $1/\sqrt{T}$ regime $\gamma(T) \propto T^{3/2}$. We observe that in all the cases the width is small compared to the quasiparticle characteristic energy which is of the order of T . We can conclude that when the heavy electron liquid is near the QCP being on the disordered side its low energy excitations are quasiparticle excitations with the effective mass $M^*(T, B)$. At this point we note that at $x \rightarrow x_{FC}$, the quasiparticle renormalization factor Z remains finite and approximately constant, and the divergence of the effective mass given by Eq. (4) is not related to vanishing Z , see e.g. [20]. Thus the notion of the quasiparticles is preserved and these are the relevant excitations when considering the thermodynamical properties of the heavy electron liquid.

As we have seen above at $T = 0$ when $r = (x - x_{FC}) \rightarrow 0$, the effective mass $M^*(r) \rightarrow \infty$ and eventually beyond the critical point x_{FC} the distance r becomes negative making the effective mass negative as follows from Eq. (4). To escape the possibility of being in unstable and meaningless states with negative values of the effective mass, the system is to undergo a quantum phase transition at the critical point. Because the kinetic energy near the Fermi surface is proportional to the inverse effective mass, this phase transition is triggered by the frustrated kinetic energy and can be recognized as FCQPT [35]. Therefore behind the critical point x_{FC} of this transition, the quasiparticle distribution function represented by the step function does not deliver the minimum to the Landau functional $E[n(\mathbf{p})]$. As a result, at $x < x_{FC}$ the quasiparticle distribution is determined by the standard equation to search the minimum of a functional [36]

$$\frac{\delta E[n(\mathbf{p})]}{\delta n(\mathbf{p}, T = 0)} = \varepsilon(\mathbf{p}) = \mu; p_i \leq p \leq p_f. \quad (16)$$

Equation (16) determines the quasiparticle distribution function $n_0(\mathbf{p})$ which delivers the minimum value to the ground state energy E . Being determined by Eq. (16), the function $n_0(\mathbf{p})$ does not coincide with the step function in the region $(p_f - p_i)$, so that $0 < n_0(\mathbf{p}) < 1$, while outside the region it coincides with the step function. It follows from Eq. (16) that the single particle spectrum or the band is completely flat over the region. Such a state was called the state with fermion condensate (FC) because quasiparticles located in the region $(p_f - p_i)$ of momentum space are pinned to the chemical potential μ [27, 36, 37]. We note that the behavior obtained for the band and quasiparticle distribution functions as observed within exactly solvable models [38, 39]. We can conclude that the relevant order parameter $\kappa(\mathbf{p}) = \sqrt{n_0(\mathbf{p})(1 - n_0(\mathbf{p}))}$ is the order parameter of the superconducting state with the infinitely small value of the superconducting gap [27]. Thus this state cannot exist at any finite temperatures and driven by the parameter x : at $x > x_{FC}$ the system is on the disordered side of FCQPT; at $x = x_{FC}$, Eq. (16) possesses the non-trivial solutions $n_0(\mathbf{p})$ with $p_i = p_F = p_f$; at $x < x_{FC}$, the system is on the ordered side.

At $T > 0$, the quasiparticle distribution is given by Eq. (2) which can be recast as

$$\varepsilon(\mathbf{p}, T) - \mu(T) = T \ln \frac{1 - n(\mathbf{p}, T)}{n(\mathbf{p}, T)}. \quad (17)$$

As $T \rightarrow 0$, $n(\mathbf{p}, T) \simeq n_0(\mathbf{p})$, the logarithm on the right hand side of Eq. (17) is finite when p belongs to the region $(p_f - p_i)$, therefore $T \ln(\dots) \rightarrow 0$, and we again arrive at Eq. (16). It follows from Eq. (17) that for $r < 0$ and $T \rightarrow 0$, the effective mass diverges as [27]

$$M^*(T) \sim p_F \frac{p_f - p_i}{4T}, \quad (18)$$

while the width of the quasiparticles being given by Eq. (15) is $\gamma \sim T$. We see that at lower temperatures and beyond FCQPT, the heavy electron liquid behaves as if it were placed at QCP, in fact it is placed at the quantum critical line and Eq. (18) is valid at any x provided that $x < x_{FC}$. One could suggest that this quantum critical behavior originates from the paramagnet to superconducting quantum phase transition and the corresponding quantum fluctuation region contributes to the thermodynamical properties. Fortunately, this is not the case since the width in the temperature of the fluctuating regime is very narrow and practically irrelevant from experimental point of view [18]. Thus, the quasiparticle scenario is applicable down to the smallest temperatures. For example, the LFL and NFL behavior and the scaling properties at microkelvin temperatures (down to 170 μ K) and ultra small magnetic fields (0.02 \sim 6.21 mT) recently investigated experimentally on the HF metal CeRu₂Si₂ [6] have been explained within the FCQPT scenario [29, 30].

At this point, we consider how the behavior of the effective mass given by Eqs. (14) and (18) correspond to experimental observations. It was recently observed that the thermal expansion coefficient $\alpha(T)/T$ measured on CeNi₂Ge₂ shows a $1/\sqrt{T}$ divergence over two orders of magnitude in the temperature range from 6 K down to at least 50 mK, while measurements on YbRh₂(Si_{0.95}Ge_{0.05})₂ demonstrate that $\alpha/T \propto 1/T$ [4], contrary to the LFL theory which yields $\alpha(T)/T \propto M^* \simeq const.$ Since the effective mass depends on T , we obtain that the $1/\sqrt{T}$ behavior, Eq. (14), is in excellent agreement with the result for the former system [40], and the $1/T$ behavior, Eq. (18), predicted in [41] corresponds to the latter HF metal. Obviously, a theory based on the critical fluctuations related to CQPT cannot explain the observed behavior of these divergences taking place at least over one order of magnitude in temperature change. One could expect that a temperature scale τ exists where the quantum fluctuations dominate the behavior of the heavy electron liquid controlling the singular contribution to the free energy at $T < \tau$. There are experimental facts collected on the magnetization and magnetic susceptibility of the HF metal CeRu₂Si₂ with $B_{c0} = 0$ [6]. These demonstrate that the application of tiny magnetic fields of 0.2 mT at microkelvin temperatures of 200 μ K restores the LFL behavior related to the presence of quasiparticles and therefore destroying the quantum fluctuations. At temperatures of as high as 3 mK these fluctuations survive to destroy the LFL behavior. However, these are destroyed by magnetic fields of 0.94 mT thereby restoring the LFL behavior. Then, the measured susceptibility and magnetization show the scaling behavior down to the lowest temperatures. On the other hand, if the scale exists the scaling behavior related with the quasiparticle contribution to the free energy would fail at $T < \tau$. In fact, the width of the regime of the fluctuations is narrow and can hardly take place even over one order of magnitude in temper-

ature change [31]. In contrast the quasiparticle scenario and the observed behavior make a perfect match. Thus, we conclude that the Landau paradigm based on the notions of the quasiparticles and order parameter is applicable when considering the heavy electron liquid.

At $T = 0$, the application of a magnetic field B splits the FC state into the Landau levels and suppresses the superconducting order parameter $\kappa(\mathbf{p})$ destroying the FC state. Therefore the LFL behavior is expected to be restored [42]. The Landau levels at the Fermi surface can be approximated by a single block whose thickness in momentum space is δp . Approximating the dispersion of quasiparticles within this block by $\varepsilon(p) \sim (p - p_F + \delta p)(p - p_F)/M$, we obtain that the effective mass $M^*(B) \sim M/(\delta p/p_F)$. The energy loss ΔE_{FC} due to rearrangement of the FC state related to this block can be estimated using the Landau formula [18]

$$\Delta E_{FC} = \int (\varepsilon(\mathbf{p}) - \mu) \delta n(\mathbf{p}) \frac{d\mathbf{p}^3}{(2\pi)^3}. \quad (19)$$

The region occupied by the variation $\delta n(\mathbf{p})$ has the length δp , while $(\varepsilon(\mathbf{p}) - \mu) \sim (p - p_F)p_F/M^*(B)$. As a result, we have $\Delta E_{FC} \sim \delta p^2/M^*(B)$. On the other hand, there is a gain $\Delta E_B \sim (B^2\mu_B)^2 M^*(B)p_F$ due to the application of the magnetic field and coming from the Zeeman splitting. Equating ΔE_B to ΔE_{FC} and taking into account that in this case $M^*(B) \propto 1/\delta p$, we arrive at the following relation

$$\frac{\delta p^2}{M^*(B)} \propto \frac{1}{(M^*(B))^3} \propto B^2 M^*(B). \quad (20)$$

It follows from Eq. (20) that the effective mass $M^*(B)$ diverges as

$$M^*(B) \propto \frac{1}{\sqrt{B - B_{c0}}}. \quad (21)$$

Here again we have substituted B by $(B - B_{c0})$ as it was done when deriving Eq. (7). Equation (21) shows that by applying the magnetic field $B > B_{c0}$ the system can be driven back into the LFL with the effective mass $M^*(B)$ depending on the magnetic field. This means that the coefficients $A(B) \propto (M^*(B))^2$, the specific heat, $C/T = \gamma_0(B) \propto M^*(B)$, and the magnetic susceptibility $\chi_0(B) \propto M^*(B)$. It is seen that the well-known empirical Kadowaki-Woods (KW) ratio [43], $K = A/\gamma_0^2 \simeq \text{const}$, is obeyed. At this point, we stress that the value of K may be dependent on the degeneracy number of quasiparticles. In the simplest case when the heavy electron liquid is formed by quasiparticles with the spin 1/2 and the degeneracy number is 2, K turns out to be close to the empirical value [33], called as the KW relation [43].

It follows from Eq. (21) that the coefficient $A(B)$ diverges as

$$A(B) \propto \frac{1}{B - B_{c0}}. \quad (22)$$

We note that in contrast to the LFL the effective mass strongly depends on the magnetic field diverging at $B - B_{c0}$. Such a behavior resembles the behavior when the heavy electron liquid approaches a field tuned QCP but in the considered case the system exhibits the behavior at any point $x < x_{FC}$, thus, in fact we are dealing with the critical line. The divergence of the effective mass at QCP is described by Eq. (7) and the coefficient $A(B)$ diverges as

$$A(B) \propto \frac{1}{(B - B_{c0})^{4/3}}. \quad (23)$$

While at the critical line, the divergence of the effective mass and the coefficient $A(B)$ are given by Eqs. (21) and (22) respectively. The observed two types of divergences and the constancy of the KW ratio are in excellent agreement with recent experimental facts collected on the HF metals YbRh₂Si₂ [3], YbRh₂(Si_{0.95}Ge_{0.05})₂ [8], YbAgGe [9] and CeCoIn₅ [5, 11, 13]. Thus we are led to the conclusion that it is possible to describe two different types of behavior related to the different exponents based on the single quantum phase transition. This is the distinctive feature of FCQPT which is in good agreement with recent measurements on the HF metals. Because the effective mass is defined by the magnetic field, Eq. (21), it is possible to control by the application of magnetic field the main thermodynamical properties of the heavy electron liquid at $x < x_{FC}$.

To analyze the behavior of the system at rising temperatures we use Eq. (5). Elevated temperatures change the LFL behavior induced by the magnetic field B into the NFL behavior. Using the same arguments which led to Eq. (11), we see that the heavy electron liquid demonstrates the $M^*(T) \propto T^{-2/3}$ regime provided that high magnetic fields are applied. Finally at $T^*(B) < T_k$, the behavior of the effective mass is given by Eq. (18). To estimate $T^*(B)$ characterizing the crossover region, we have to equate the effective mass $M^*(T)$ defined by Eq. (18) to $M^*(B)$ given by Eq. (21), $M^*(T) \sim M^*(B)$. As a result, we obtain

$$T^*(B) \propto \sqrt{B - B_{c0}}. \quad (24)$$

In summary, we have shown that the Landau paradigm is still applicable when considering the low temperature properties of the heavy electron liquid, whose understanding has been problematic largely because of the absence of theoretical guidance. In contrast with the conventional Landau quasiparticles, the effective mass of the considered quasiparticles in this letter strongly depends on the temperature and the applied magnetic field, while the order parameter is destroyed at any finite temperature. These quasiparticles and the order parameter are well defined and capable of describing both the LFL and the NFL behaviors of the HF metals and their universal thermodynamic

properties down to the lowest temperatures. We have shown that even such a subtle behavior as the recently observed anomalous $T^{2/3}$ dependence of the resistivity and the corresponding scaling behavior can be understood. Additionally, we have demonstrated that this unusual behavior of both the order parameter and the quasiparticles is determined by FCQPT which allows the existence of the quasiparticles down to the lowest temperatures. In that case we obtain a unique possibility to control the essence of the HF metals by magnetic fields in a wide range of temperatures.

Acknowledgements

The visit of VRS to Clark Atlanta University has been supported by NSF through a grant to CTSPS. MYaA is grateful to the S.A. Shonbrunn Research Fund for support of his research. AZM is supported by US DOE, Division of Chemical Sciences, Office of Basic Energy Sciences, Office of Energy Research. This work was supported in part by the the National Science Foundation under Grant No. PHY99-07949 and by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research.

-
- [1] S. Sachdev, Quantum Phase transitions Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999.
 - [2] M. Vojta, Rep. Prog. Phys. 66 (2003) 2069.
 - [3] P. Gegenwart et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 89 (2002) 056402.
 - [4] R. K  chler et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 91 (2003) 066405.
 - [5] J. Paglione et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 91 (2003) 246405.
 - [6] D. Takahashi et al., Phys. Rev. B 67 (2003) 180407.
 - [7] A. Bianchi et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 91 (2003) 257001.
 - [8] J. Custers et al., Nature 424 (2003) 524.
 - [9] S.L. Bud'ko, E. Morosan, P.C. Canfield, Phys. Rev. 69 (2004) 014415.
 - [10] C. Capan et al., Phys. Rev. B 70 (2004) 180502.
 - [11] J. Paglione et al., cond-mat/0405157.
 - [12] R. K  chler et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 93 (2004) 096402.
 - [13] F. Romning et al., cond-mat/0409750.
 - [14] T. Senthil, M. Vojta, S. Sachdev, Phys. Rev. B 69 (2004) 035111; T. Senthil, S. Sachdev, M. Vojta, cond-mat/0409033.

- [15] T. Senthil, cond-mat/0411275; T. Senthil, M. Vojta, cond-mat/0411659.
- [16] T. Senthil et al., Phys. Rev. B 70 (2004) 144407; T. Senthil et al., Science 303 (2004) 1490.
- [17] L. Zhu, M. Garst, A. Rosch, Q. Si, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91 (2003) 066404.
- [18] E.M. Lifshitz, L.P. Pitaevskii, Statistical Physics, Part 2, Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford, 1999.
- [19] V.R. Shaginyan, JETP Lett. 77 (2003) 99; V.R. Shaginyan, JETP Lett. 77 (2003) 178.
- [20] J.W. Clark, V.A. Khodel, M.V. Zverev, V.M. Yakovenko, Phys. Rep. 391 (2004) 123.
- [21] A.A. Shashkin et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 91 (2003) 046403; A.A. Shashkin et al., Phys. Rev. B 66 (2002) 073303; A.A. Shashkin et al., cond-mat/0409100; Y.-W. Tan et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 94 (2005) 16405.
- [22] A. Casey et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 90 (2003) 115301.
- [23] J. Boronat et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 91 (2003) 085302.
- [24] Y. Zhang, V. M. Yakovenko, S. Das Sarma, cond-mat/0410039.
- [25] Y. Zhang, S. Das Sarma, Phys. Rev. B 70 (2004) 035104.
- [26] V.A. Khodel, V.R. Shaginyan, M.V. Zverev, JETP Lett. 65 (1997) 253.
- [27] V.A. Khodel, V.R. Shaginyan, V.V. Khodel, Phys. Rep. 249 (1994) 1; V.A. Khodel, V.R. Shaginyan, Condens. Matter Theories 12 (1997) 222.
- [28] G.R. Stewart, Rev. Mod. Phys. 73 (2001) 797.
- [29] J.W. Clark, V.A. Khodel, M.V. Zverev, Phys. Rev B 71 (2005) 012401.
- [30] V.R. Shaginyan, JETP Lett. 79 (2004) 286.
- [31] E.M. Lifshitz, L.P. Pitaevskii, Statistical Physics, Part 1, Butterworth-Heinemann, 2000, p. 168.
- [32] V.R. Shaginyan, JETP Lett. 80 (2004) 263.
- [33] V.A. Khodel, P. Schuck, Z. Phys. B 104 (1997) 505.
- [34] J. Dukelsky et al., Z. Phys. B 102 (1997) 245.
- [35] V.R. Shaginyan, J.G. Han, J. Lee, Phys. Lett. A 329 (2004) 108.
- [36] V.A. Khodel, V.R. Shaginyan, JETP Lett. 51 (1990) 553.
- [37] G. E. Volovik, JETP Lett. 53 (1991) 222.
- [38] V.Yu. Irkhin, A.A. Katanin, M.I. Katsnelson, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89 (2002) 076401.
- [39] D. Lidsky et al., Phys. Rev. B 57 (1998) 1340.
- [40] M.Ya. Amusia, A.Z. Msezane, V.R. Shaginyan, Phys. Lett. A 320 (2004) 459.
- [41] M.V. Zverev, V.A. Khodel, V.R. Shaginyan, JETP Lett. 65 (1997) 863.
- [42] Yu.G. Pogorelov, V.R. Shaginyan, JETP Lett. 76 (2002) 532; V.R. Shaginyan, cond-mat/0308421.
- [43] K. Kadowaki, S.B. Woods, Solid State Commun. 58 (1986) 507.