

# Quantum Theory of Pom eranchuk Transition in Two D im ensional Ferm i Liquids via H igh D im ensional B osonization

Kun Yang

NH M FL and D epartm ent of P hysics, F lorida State University, Tallahassee, F lorida 32306, USA  
(April 14, 2024)

We use high dimensional bosonization to derive an effective eld theory that describes the Pom eranchuk transition in two-dimensional Ferm i liquids. The bosonization approach explicitly retains all low-energy degrees of freedom of the system. The resultant theory has dynam ical exponent  $z = 2$  at tree level and upper critical dimension  $d_c = 2$ , thus in 2D the system is at the upper critical dimension. These results differ from those of an earlier study based on integrating out ferm ions.

P acks num bers: 71.10 H f, 71.10 P m

Introduction and M otivation | Quantum phase transitions [1] are of tremendous current interest to the physics community in general and condensed matter physicists in particular. Significant progress has been made in theoretical studies of quantum phase transitions in various spin and boson models [1]; examples include various magnetic transitions in insulating spin systems, and superconductor transitions in bosonic systems. Historically however, the first examples of quantum phase transitions studied theoretically are ferromagnetic and antiferromagnetic transitions in itinerant electron systems, or metals [2]. Ironically, quantum phase transitions in itinerant electron systems turn out to be among the most difficult to study theoretically, and our current understanding of these transitions is much more limited compared to those of spin and boson systems. The origin of the difficulty is not hard to see. Just like classical phase transitions, theoretical studies of quantum phase transitions are based on (quantum versions) of G insburg-Landau type of free energy functionals, and their analyses based on Wilsonian renormalization group (RG). The G insburg-Landau free energy is a functional of the order parameter, which are bosonic degrees of freedom; fluctuations of their long-wave length, low-frequency/energy components determine the critical properties of the transitions. In itinerant electron systems however, the fundamental low-energy degrees of freedom are the gapless electronic states near the Ferm i surface; these fermionic modes at finite wavevectors are difficult to incorporate within the G insburg-Landau-W ilson (GLW) paradigm. In the approach pioneered by Hertz [2] and extended by Millis [3] and others, one decouples the electron-electron interaction using Hubbard-Stratanovich transformation in an appropriate channel, integrates out the fermionic degrees of freedom, and arrives at a GLW-like free energy functional that involves the Hubbard-Stratanovich auxiliary eld only, which are bosonic degrees of freedom and interpreted as the order parameter. It has been realized recently, however, that the procedure of integrating out gapless fermions leads to singularities in the expansion of the resultant bosonic free energy functional in terms of

the order parameter, or its gradients [4]. Such singularities may invalidate the standard classification and analyzes (based on power-counting) of various terms of the GLW-like theory obtained this way, and profoundly affect the critical behavior of the transitions [4]. The presence of such singularities is a consequence of integrating out gapless degrees of freedom, and also reflects the fact that the GLW-like theory obtained this way only provides an incomplete description of the low-energy physics of the system. At present there is no consensus on the appropriate approach to study quantum phase transitions in itinerant electron systems in general.

Recently, we studied the ferromagnetic transition in one-dimensional (1D) itinerant electron systems, using a different approach [5]. The idea was quite simple: In 1D one can use the very powerful machinery of bosonization, which allows one to obtain a bosonic description of the fermionic system, without losing any fermionic degrees of freedom; i.e., one can represent the fermionic degrees of freedom using bosonic degrees of freedom faithfully, via bosonization. Extensive previous studies have established that the paramagnetic phase in 1D is described by a free boson theory, known as the Luttinger liquid theory in this context; this is a consequence of the fact that all possible bosonic interactions are irrelevant at the Luttinger liquid fixed point, and scale to zero in the low energy limit. We have shown [5], on the other hand, at the Gaussian critical point of the ferromagnetic transition, interactions are relevant, and must be included in the analyzes of the critical behavior, as well as the ordered phase. We have performed such analyzes using RG, and found the behavior of the system at the ferromagnetic critical point is quite different from that of the Luttinger liquid, due to the presence of interaction; this "non-Luttinger liquid" behavior is in close correspondence with the experimentally observed non-Ferm i liquid behavior near magnetic transitions in higher dimensions. It is worth emphasizing that the theory we developed using bosonization does not suffer from the singularities encountered in the Hertz-M illis approach in high dimensional systems discussed above, since no low-

energy fermionic degrees of freedom are lost [6].

The bosonization machinery has been generalized to higher dimensional systems [7-10]. In general bosonization is not as powerful in high D as in 1D. This is because to bosonize the fermions, one needs to divide the Fermi surface (which is a continuous manifold in high D in contrast to discrete points in 1D) into many small patches that are almost flat; the scattering processes that bring the electron from one patch to another show up as non-linear operators within bosonization, rendering them difficult to treat. What the bosonization approach does treat well are the forward scattering processes which leave the electrons in the same patch that they start from, as they are represented by quadratic terms of the boson field; these are precisely the Fermi liquid interactions. For this reason bosonization gives a very good description of the Fermi liquid phase [7-10].

In the present work we use high D bosonization to study the Pomerenchuk transition in 2D spinless Fermi liquids, a quantum phase transition at which the Fermi surface develops anisotropy spontaneously, which is of considerable current interest [11-13]. The bosonization approach is particularly useful here because the Pomerenchuk transition is driven by Fermi liquid interactions. The strategy here is similar to Ref. [5]. Our central result is the GLW theory for the transition, Eq. (16). From the action (16) we can readily read out that the tree-level dynamical exponent  $z = 2$  at the transition, and upper critical dimension  $d_c = 4$ ,  $z = 2$ . Thus in 2D the system is at the upper critical dimension. This differs from the result an earlier study [11] based on Hertz-Millis type of approach, which found  $z = 3$  and  $d_c = 1$ . We will discuss the origin of the difference of these two approaches.

**Bosonized Description of Fermi Liquids** | We start by reviewing the bosonized description of Fermi liquids, which also sets the notation for the rest of the paper. As the first step we divide the Fermi surface into many small patches of linear size  $k_F$ , so that within each patch the Fermi surface is approximately flat, and for electronic states sufficiently close to the Fermi surface (within a cutoff distance  $k_F$ ), the energy is approximately linear in momentum. For each patch we introduce a patch density operator

$$\rho(S; q) = \sum_k \rho(S; k) c_{k-q}^\dagger c_k; \quad (1)$$

where  $S$  is the patch label, and  $\rho(S; k)$  is 1 when  $k$  is inside the box of size  $D^{-1}$  enclosing patch  $S$  ( $D$  is the dimensionality of the system), and zero otherwise; it ensures we are summing over states near patch  $S$  only. They satisfy the bosonic commutation relation

$$[\rho(S; q); \rho(T; q^0)] = \delta_{S,T} \delta_{q, -q^0} (q^0 \cdot \hat{q}); \quad (2)$$

with  $\hat{q} = D^{-1} (L=2)^D$ , and  $L$  is the linear size of the system and  $\hat{n}_S$  is the unit vector pointing in the outward

normal direction of patch  $S$ . In the case of 1D the Fermi surface patch reduces to a discrete Fermi point, and Eq. (2) reduces to the familiar 1D commutator of density operators.

The foundation of bosonization lies on the fact that both the kinetic energy and the Fermi liquid (or forward scattering) interaction terms of the electron Hamiltonian can be expressed in terms of  $\rho(S; q)$ . Within the approximation that the kinetic energy is linear in momentum within each patch:  $\epsilon_S(k) = v_F(S) \hat{n}_S \cdot [k - k_F(S)]$ , where  $v_F(S)$  is the Fermi velocity of patch  $S$ , the kinetic energy is quadratic in  $\rho(S; q)$ :

$$T = \sum_{S, q} \frac{1}{2} [v_F(S)]^2 \rho(S; q) \rho(S; -q); \quad (3)$$

Non-linearity in the spectrum leads to higher order terms in  $\rho(S; q)$ ; they are irrelevant for the description of the Fermi liquid fixed point, but are important for the description of the transition and will be discussed later on. The Fermi liquid (or forward-scattering) interaction takes the form

$$V = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{S, T, q} V_{S,T}(q) \rho(S; q) \rho(T; -q); \quad (4)$$

where  $V_{S,T}(q)$  is the forward scattering matrix element between states in patches  $S$  and  $T$ ; at the Fermi liquid fixed point its dependence on  $q$  is irrelevant and we can take the  $q = 0$  value in the long-wavelength limit (here we do not consider possible singularity due to long-range interaction). The Fermi liquid Hamiltonian  $H = T + V$ , which is expressed exclusively in terms of the patch density operators  $\rho(S; q)$ , also has an equivalent Lagrangian description:

$$L = L_0 + \int d^D x \int dt \rho(S; q) g - H \int d^D x \int dt \rho(S; q) g; \quad (5)$$

where the dynamical term [9,13]

$$L_0 = \frac{i}{2} \sum_{S, q} \rho_t(S; q) [\partial_t \rho(S; q)] \rho(S; -q) = (q \cdot \hat{q}) \rho(S; q) \partial_t \rho(S; -q) \quad (6)$$

properly enforces the commutation relation (2).

**Two-dimensional Isotropic Fermi Liquid** | We now turn our discussion to the case  $D = 2$ , and assume isotropy so that the Fermi surface is a circle. In this case the patch  $S$  can be labeled by an angular variable  $\theta$ , and in the limit  $k_F \rightarrow \infty$  may be treated as a continuous variable ranging between 0 and  $2\pi$ . In this case it is natural to perform a Fourier transformation with respect to  $\theta$ :

$$\rho_m(q) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta e^{im\theta} \rho(\theta; q); \quad (7)$$

$$\rho(\theta; q) = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{im\theta} \rho_m(q); \quad (8)$$

The cutoff in the range of  $m$  is due to the small but finite patch size. We can now express Eq. (6) in terms of  $\phi_m(q)$ :

$$L_0 = (ik_F = 2) \sum_{q,m,n} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i(m-n)t} [\phi_{t-m}(q)]_n(q) = [q] \hat{n}(q) \\ = \frac{i k_F}{2\pi} \sum_{q,m} \frac{[\phi_{t-m}(q)]}{2\pi} \sum_{l \text{ odd}} (1)^{\frac{l-1}{2}} e^{ilq} \phi_{m-l}(q); \quad (9)$$

where  $q$  is the angle of 2D vector  $q$ . It is very important to notice that in (9)  $\phi$ 's with even  $m$  are coupled to  $\phi$ 's with odd  $n$  only, and vice versa. This is because the integral over  $t$  vanishes when  $m-n$  is even, so in the last line of (9) the sum over  $l$  is for odd integers.

On the other hand it is easy to show that both  $T$  and  $V$  are diagonal in  $m$ , and the Hamiltonian takes the form

$$H = \frac{v_F k_F}{2\pi} \sum_{m,q} (1 + F_m) \phi_m(q) \phi_m(q); \quad (10)$$

where the dimensionless Landau parameter

$$F_m = \left(\frac{L}{2}\right)^2 \frac{k_F^2}{v_F} e^{im} V(q); \quad (11)$$

in which  $V(q)$  is defined through  $V_{S,T}(q) = V(q; S, T; q)$ , and we take  $q = 0$  here in the long wave-length description of Fermi liquid; the  $q$  dependence of  $V$  will become important and discussed later on. The stability of the isotropic Fermi liquid phase requires  $F_m > -1$  [9]. Thus combining (9) and (10) we obtain a quadratic theory in terms of complex bosonic variables  $\phi_m(q)$ , that describes an isotropic 2D Fermi liquid. Notice that  $L_0$  involves one time derivative of  $\phi_m(q)$ ; this indicates  $\phi_m(q)$  are constrained degrees of freedom (or their conjugate momenta are not independent variables). To bring  $L$  closer to the more familiar 1D bosonized description of Luttinger liquids, we can integrate out  $\phi_m(q)$  with odd  $m$ , and obtain the Lagrangian with even  $m$  degrees of freedom:

$$L_{\text{even}} = L_{\text{even}}^0 + H_{\text{even}}; \quad (12)$$

$$L_{\text{even}}^0 = \frac{A_e k_F}{v_F} \sum_{q,m \text{ even}} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i(m-n)(q+\frac{\pi}{2})} \phi_{t-m}(q) \phi_n(q); \quad (13)$$

where  $A_e = \frac{P}{\text{odd } 4(1+F_1)}$  and  $H_{\text{even}}$  takes the same form of (10) but with sum over even  $m$ . Despite the fact that we have integrated out modes with odd  $m$ ,  $L_{\text{even}}$  is completely equivalent to  $L$  because  $L_{\text{even}}^0$  contains two time derivatives and thus the conjugate momenta of  $\phi_m$  are independent degrees of freedom, which actually correspond to  $\phi_m$  with odd  $m$ . Alternatively we may choose to integrate out modes with even  $m$  to obtain a dual description  $L_{\text{odd}}$ ; this is analogous to the case in 1D where

we may write down the Luttinger liquid Lagrangians in terms of either density or current fields, which are symmetric and antisymmetric combinations of left and right moving fields respectively. Clearly  $L$  and  $L_{\text{even}}$  are scale invariant field theories with dynamical exponent  $z = 1$ , because there is a factor  $1 = \frac{1}{2\pi}$  associated with each time derivative (or  $!$  in frequency space) while  $q$  is invariant under scale transformations.

The Pomeranchuk Instability and Ginsburg-Landau-Wilson Theory for the Transition | Obviously the isotropic Fermi liquid phase becomes unstable when  $F_m$  reaches and goes below  $-1$  for any  $m$ ; this is the Pomeranchuk instability. Let us assume this occurs (without losing generality) in an even channel  $m_0 \notin 0$ . In this case we need to retain the next leading quadratic term in  $H$  for this channel, of the form

$$V^0 = a \sum_q \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \phi_{m_0}^2(q) \phi_{m_0}(q) + \dots; \quad (14)$$

it originates from the  $q$  dependence of  $V_{S,T}(q)$  in Eq. (4), neglected at the isotropic Fermi liquid fixed point due to its irrelevance there. Here we assume  $a > 0$ . To maintain stability, we also need to keep non-quadratic terms [13] of the form

$$T^0 = b \sum_{m,n,q,q^0} \phi_m(q) \phi_n(q^0) \phi_{m-n}(q-q^0) \\ + c \sum_{m,n,q,q^0} \phi_m(q) \phi_n(q^0) \phi_{m-n-1}(q-q^0) \\ + \dots; \quad (15)$$

whose origin is the nonlinearity of electron dispersion near the Fermi surface ( $\partial/\partial k_F$ ) and  $c/\partial^2/\partial k_F^2$ ), again neglected at the isotropic Fermi liquid fixed point due to its irrelevance. To proceed we focus for the moment on the  $m_0$  channel where the instability occurs, and neglect its coupling to other channels. From Eqs. (13, 14, 15) we obtain the following GLW effective field theory with Euclidean action

$$S = \int d^D q d! f \left( \frac{!^2}{2\pi} + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \phi_{m_0}^2(q;!) + r \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \phi_{m_0}(q;!)(q;!)\right) \\ + \left( \frac{1}{2\pi} \right)^0 \frac{!^2}{2\pi} \text{Re} e^{2im_0 q} (q;!)(q;!)\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \\ + u \int d^D x d! \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \phi_{m_0}^4(x;!)\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt; \quad (16)$$

where  $\phi_{m_0}$  is a complex bosonic field that plays the role of order parameter of the theory, the "mass"-like parameter  $r/(1+F_{m_0})$ , and  $u/c$  (also assumed positive); proper rescaling of the field as well as space-time coordinates have been performed to ensure the form taken by the quadratic terms in Eq. (16). This highly non-local action is somewhat similar to the one studied by Sachdev and Senthil (see Eq. 4.11 of Ref. [14]) in a different context; the crucial difference here are the new quadratic

terms in the second line of Eq. (16), which encode the information about the symmetry properties of the order parameter as well as the Fermi surface dynamics. Clearly at the Gaussian critical point  $r = 0$ , we have dynamical exponent  $z = 2$  from the  $\omega$  and  $q$  dependence of the quadratic part of the action. The tree-level flow equation for the interaction is simply given by its dimensionality:

$$\frac{du}{d \log s} = (4 - z - D)u; \quad (17)$$

where  $s$  is the scaling parameter for spatial coordinates; we thus find the upper critical dimension of the theory to be  $d_c = 4 - z = 2$ . Higher order couplings are irrelevant at  $D = 2$ . These are the central results of this paper.

We now show that couplings to the other (non-critical) channels do not change the form of the action (16), or the associated critical behavior, for the following reasons. (i) For the other channels the action contains a non-zero mass-like term  $(1 + F_m) m(q) m(-q)$ . Under the  $z = 2$  scaling the  $m$  mass  $1 + F_m$  is a relevant operator that grows as  $s^2$  under scaling [15]. Thus in the long-wavelength limit all other channels become "infinitely massive" and thus drop out of the low-energy effective action eventually. (ii) Before this limit is reached, one needs to integrate over modes in these channels with wave-vectors at the cutoff as RG proceeds; this generates various new couplings in the  $m_0$  channel, in addition to renormalizing the existing ones. Due to the presence of the mass-like terms, this is a well-behaved procedure, and due to the nature of the coupling in Eqs. (12,13) between the  $m_0$  and other channels, the only possible singular new couplings have positive powers of  $\omega^2 = \mathbf{j} \cdot \mathbf{j}$  attached to them, with no other singular dependence on  $\omega$  or  $q$ . Under  $z = 2$  scaling,  $\omega^2$  scales to zero faster than  $\mathbf{j} \cdot \mathbf{j}$  and as a consequence all such couplings are irrelevant.

Normally one would conclude that the critical behavior of the transition is mean-field like with logarithmic corrections, based on the fact that we are at the upper critical dimension. While this may very well be the case here, it should be noted that the quadratic terms of the action (16) are quite unconventional, which may lead to unconventional flow to the interaction  $u$  beyond tree level. We plan to study this as well as electronic properties of the system near the transition in future work.

In an earlier work [11], Oganessian, Fradkin and Kivelson obtained a bosonic theory for the transition from isotropic to nematic Fermi liquids by integrating out fermions via Hubbard-Stratanovich decoupling, similar to the Hertz-Millis theory. This transition corresponds to case  $m_0 = 2$  in our theory. These authors found  $z = 3$  and  $d_c = 1$ . The origin of  $z = 3$  lies in Landau damping, which is a consequence of integrating out gapless fermions. In our approach there is no analog of Landau damping. Technically this is because we do not integrate out any gapless modes. More fundamentally however, it is clear that the transition is driven by a bosonic eigen

mode whose energy goes through zero; by definition eigenmodes are not damped. In the presence of interactions with other degrees of freedom of the systems, the wavefunction of this unstable mode needs to be determined self-consistently, and RG is a systematic procedure that allows the long wavelength mode to adjust itself to remain an eigenmode as one approaches the low-energy limit. On the other hand if one integrates out the gapless fermions up-front, no adjustment is allowed and the physically relevant modes appear damped. It thus appears to be an artifact of this procedure.

This work was supported by NSF grant DMR-0225698.

- 
- [1] For a general introduction, see, e. g., S. Sachdev, *Quantum Phase Transitions*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999.
  - [2] J. A. Hertz, *Phys. Rev. B* **14**, 1165 (1976).
  - [3] A. J. M. Illis, *Phys. Rev. B* **48**, 7183 (1993).
  - [4] See, e.g., D. Belitz and T. R. Kirkpatrick, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 247202 (2002); T. R. Kirkpatrick and D. Belitz, *Phys. Rev. B* **67**, 024419 (2003); A. V. Chubukov, C. Pepin, and J. Rech, *cond-mat/0311420* (2003).
  - [5] Kun Yang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 066401 (2004).
  - [6] Recently K. Sengupta and Y. B. Kim (*cond-mat/0501689*) have shown that the same theory could be obtained by using the Hertz-Millis approach and integrating out fermions in 1D. The fundamental reason is in 1D all degrees of freedom are collective and there are no independent quasi-particle excitations. As we will see below the situation is very different in high dimensions.
  - [7] F. D. M. Haldane, *Helv. Phys. Acta.* **65**, 152 (1992); in *Proceedings of International School of Physics "Enrico Fermi"*, Varenna 1992, edited by J. R. Schrieffer and R. A. Brogia (North-Holland, New York, 1994).
  - [8] A. Houghton and J. B. Marston, *Phys. Rev. B* **48**, 7790 (1993); A. Houghton, H.-J. Kwon, and J. B. Marston, *Advances in Physics* **49**, 141 (2000).
  - [9] A. H. Castro Neto and Eduardo Fradkin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **72**, 1393 (1994); *Phys. Rev. B* **49**, 10877 (1994); *Phys. Rev. B* **51**, 4084 (1995).
  - [10] Peter Kopietz, *Bosonization of Interacting Fermions in Arbitrary Dimensions*, Springer, Berlin (1997).
  - [11] Vadim Oganessian, Steven A. Kivelson, and Eduardo Fradkin, *Phys. Rev. B* **64**, 195109 (2001).
  - [12] Ganpathy Murthy and R. Shankar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 066801 (2003); Y.-B. Kim and H.-Y. Kee, *J. Phys. Cond. Mat.* **16**, 3139 (2004).
  - [13] Daniel G. Barci and Luis E. Oxman, *Phys. Rev. B* **67**, 205108 (2003).
  - [14] S. Sachdev and T. Senthil, *Ann. Phys.* **251**, 76 (1996).
  - [15] These terms are marginal under the  $z = 1$  scaling appropriate for the Fermi liquid fixed point; since  $z$  changes at the Pomerenchuk transition, their scaling behavior changes as well.