

(Dated: March 23, 2024)

PACS numbers: 03.65.Yz, 03.75.Lm

where  $\sim = (\sim^2 + \sim^2)$  and  $\sim = (\sim^2 + \sim^2)$ . The first term in Eq. (2) is the well studied logarithmic correlations. The second part of the propagator is the Aharonov-Bohm phase that the particle picks due to the magnetic field. Using this result, it is simple to write the



to show that the flux per plaquette needed to generate this Berry's phase is  $p$ . Hence, within the SCHA the weak barrier problem has an additional duality property, which leaves  $\tilde{\phi}(\mathbf{r})$  unchanged, but replaces  $g \rightarrow 1/(p^2 g)$ .

Mapping to a spin chain for  $q = 2$ . For  $\tilde{\phi} = 1/2$  in the weak coupling case, or  $\tilde{\phi} = 1/2$  in the tight binding limit, the operators  $T_x$  and  $T_y$  in Eq. (4) reduce to Pauli matrices,  $\sigma_x; \sigma_y$ . This equivalence suggests the use of a spin Hamiltonian with the same universal properties for the environment. Thus we replace Eq. (4) by two semi-infinite XXZ chains

$$H = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \left( \frac{1}{2} \sigma_n^x \sigma_{n+1}^x + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_n^y \sigma_{n+1}^y + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_n^z \sigma_{n+1}^z \right) + v_s \left( \frac{1}{2} \sigma_1^x \sigma_0^x + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_0^y \sigma_1^y \right) \quad (8)$$

where  $\tilde{\phi} = \cos[(1 - g)]$  and  $v_s = j \sin(g) / (1 + 2 \arcsin[\cos(g)])$ .

The spin Hamiltonian provides a different perspective of the infinite coupling limit studied by SCHA. As

$\tilde{\phi} \rightarrow 1$ , the low energy sector tends towards the tensor product of two semi-infinite chains (starting from sites

2) plus the low energy excitations of the three strongly coupled spins at sites -1, 0 and 1. As the SCHA suggested, there are four degenerate states (see Fig. (1)).

When we consider  $\tilde{\phi} < 1$ , the interaction between sites 2 and -1 can be treated as a perturbation of order

$1 - \tilde{\phi}$  and the degeneracy is lifted to a doublet. In fact, this doublet is protected by a hidden symmetry (see below). After defining dual spin variables [21],  $\tilde{\sigma}_n^x = \frac{1}{2} (\sigma_n^x + \sigma_{n+1}^x)$  and  $\tilde{\sigma}_n^z = \frac{1}{2} (\sigma_n^z + \sigma_{n+1}^z)$ , we find that  $[\tilde{\sigma}_0^z, H] = 0$ . This conserved quantity is non-local in the original spin (dissipative) problem, thus it corresponds to a topological charge.

We can further understand the intermediate fixed point by solving the "non-interacting" problem,  $g = 1/2$ . As a bonus to be solvable, it is also believed that this point separates four different phases in the  $(\tilde{\phi}; \tilde{\phi})$  plane [4]. Using the dual spin variables, the Hamiltonian breaks into three independent parts,

$$H = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \left( \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\sigma}_n^x + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\sigma}_{n-1}^z \tilde{\sigma}_n^z + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\sigma}_n^x + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\sigma}_n^z \tilde{\sigma}_{n+1}^z \right) + V; \quad (9)$$

with the definitions:  $\tilde{\sigma}_n^x = \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{2n}$ ,  $\tilde{\sigma}_n^z = \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{2n-1}$  and  $V = (v_s - 1) \frac{1}{2} \sigma_0^x + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_1^z \sigma_0^z$ . Eq. (9) implies that the odd sites of the original chain are mapped into two semi-infinite quantum Ising chains with open boundary conditions. The even sites are mapped into a single quantum chain and an impurity term ( $V$ ). After fermionizing the three chains and taking the continuous limit, it is straightforward to show that  $V$  is an irrelevant operator of dimension 2. Hence, the manifestly conformal invariant RG fixed point is  $v_s = 1$ . In the fermionic language, the conservation of the topological charge is represented by a single Majorana fermion localized at the origin. In addition, we just showed that for  $g = 1/2$  the fixed point is the resonance condition to a fermionic channel. Since

$\dim V = 2$  at the "non-interacting" point, it is very likely that  $V$  will also be an irrelevant operator for other values of  $g$ . Eventually, as we consider  $g \rightarrow 1$ , the repulsive interaction between fermions becomes sufficiently strong to close the fermionic channel through the localization of a second Majorana ( $\neq 0$  fixed point).

The correspondence with the SCHA gives us a simple picture about the particle mobility. In SCHA, the four minima of the potential are organized in sub-lattices depicted in Fig. (1). With the mapping to the spin chain, they can also be classified accordingly to the two possible values of the topological charge ( $\tilde{\phi}$ ). This fact suggests that at the intermediate fixed point the lattice breaks into two sub-lattices. Tunneling between minima of different sub-lattices does not occur, while the amplitude for wells in the same sub-lattice is given by the renormalized value of  $1 - \tilde{\phi}$ . This is very similar to the intermediate fixed point of a Brownian motion in a triangular lattice [19], where there are three geometrical sub-lattices. For intermediate values of dissipation, there is a regime where the particle avoids one of the sub-lattices, but moves on the other two. This scenario of an intermediate mobility can be further supported by noticing that for the exact solution,  $g = 1/2$ , the current operator also becomes quadratic in the fermion operators. Since the correlations will decay as  $t^{-2}$  at long times, the particle mobility,  $\mu_{ij} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \langle h_i(0) | j(0) \rangle$ , is finite at the fixed point [22].

Fixed point at or near  $g = 1$ . When  $\tilde{\phi} \rightarrow 1$  the diagonal correlations between the  $e^{i\tilde{\sigma}_x(0)}$ ;  $e^{i\tilde{\sigma}_y(0)}$  operators decay as  $t^{-2}$ . The RG equation can be derived in an  $\epsilon = 1 - g$  [14, 23] expansion scheme,

$$\partial_t C = C \sin^2(\epsilon) q^{-3} + O(\epsilon^2); \quad (10)$$

where  $C$  is a constant of order unity. For  $q = 2$ , Eq. (10) implies a renormalized  $\tilde{\phi} / p$ . As  $g \rightarrow 1$ , this fixed point merges with the trivial  $\tilde{\phi} = 0$ . The physical meaning of  $\tilde{\phi} = 0$  is straightforward when we look from the perspective of a quantum impurity problem. In Eq. (4), the two bosonic fields favor the localization of the spin variable along orthogonal directions. Thus, when  $g = 1$ , the "frustration" decouples the spin from the baths [24].

Phase diagram for half flux per unit cell. We now focus on a magnetic field which corresponds to half flux per plaquette,  $\tilde{\phi} = 1/2$ , which illustrates the different fixed points mentioned above. We summarize the discussion on Fig. (2).

In the tight binding limit, the particle is localized for  $\tilde{\phi} < 1$ . Close to  $\tilde{\phi} = 1$  there is an intermediate fixed point,  $\tilde{\phi} / p = 1$ . For  $\tilde{\phi} = 1/2$  the exact solution shows that  $\tilde{\phi} < 1$ . Finally, the duality transformation obtained by variational means indicates that a localized solution is unstable for  $\tilde{\phi} = 1/4$ , so that an intermediate fixed point exists for  $1/4 < \tilde{\phi} < 1$ .

In the weak barrier limit, except at  $\tilde{\phi} = 1/2$ , the fixed point is unstable for all values of  $\tilde{\phi}$ . For  $\tilde{\phi} = 1/2$  the




FIG. 2: Phase diagram of the dissipative Hofstadter model with half flux per unit cell,  $\phi = 1/2$ . The lines and symbols show the expected fixed points.

RG flow of  $\lambda$  is zero, leading to a line of fixed points [4]. This point in the phase diagram is equivalent to the well known line of fixed points of the model without the magnetic field [2]. This happens because as the particle hops in the "dual" lattice  $\tilde{r}$ , it picks a phase of  $2\pi$  around each plaquette. For  $\phi = 1/2$ , the partition function is identical to the partition function in the tight-binding limit. Since the model is self-dual there ought to be at least one fixed point at intermediate coupling. For  $\phi = 1/2$  we find  $\tilde{\phi} = 1/2$ . The model has the same properties as when  $\tilde{\phi} = 1/2$ , and the action, eq.(1), is formally equivalent to the action obtained in the tight-binding limit. It seems likely that the fixed point obtained from the variational approach in this regime has the same properties as the one in the tight-binding limit.

In the region  $0 < \phi < 1/2$  the weak and tight-binding limits have RG flow towards strong coupling. The SCHA suggests that the particle is indeed delocalized with a phenomenology quite different from the  $\phi = 0$  fixed point. Instead of moving in the "dual" lattice  $\tilde{r}$ , it freely moves in the lattice induced by the potential [25].

The existence of the self-dual point strongly suggests that for some parameters both the weak and the tight-binding limits can be used to describe the model. However, at  $\phi = 1/2$  the different approaches lead to markedly different results. Similar discrepancies do exist in many other parts of the phase diagram. Hence, it is not obvious how to extrapolate the results from the weak-barrier case to the tight-binding limit and vice-versa. These differences between the weak-barrier and tight-binding limits are related to the range of validity of the field theories that describe each one. For instance, when the RG flow of the weak coupling case leads to energy scales of the order of  $\max(\hbar v_F, \hbar \omega_c)$ , Eq. (1) is no longer justified. Then, the theory must be supplemented with operators due to transitions to higher Landau levels. This is clear in the  $\phi = 1/2$  case, where the particle in the weak-barrier limit effectively hops in a "dual" lattice with lattice

parameter  $\tilde{a} = 2a$ . Hence, starting from Eq. (1) it is not possible to account for the effects of the particle tunneling between minima of the periodic potential separated by  $a$ . This means that at a certain energy scale the line of fixed points stops, and the problem starts to renormalize to the exact solution that we discussed in the text. Conversely, using the duality properties of the model, there are other regions of the phase diagram where the tight-binding suffers by the same problem.

In conclusion, we studied the dissipative Hofstadter model using scaling, exact results, and a variational approach. This allowed us to characterize the intermediate coupling fixed point of the model. Finally, we showed that results obtained in weak-barrier or tight-binding limits cannot be straightforwardly connected.

One of us (F.G.) is thankful to the Quantum Condensed Matter Visitor's Program at Boston University. A.H.C.N. was partially supported through NSF grant DMR-0343790.

- 
- [1] A. O. Caldeira and A. Leggett, *Ann. Phys.* 149, 374 (1983).
  - [2] A. Schmid, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 51, 1506 (1983).
  - [3] S. Dattagupta and J. Singh, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 79, 961 (1997).
  - [4] C. Callan and D. Freed, *Nucl. Phys. B* 374, 543 (1992).
  - [5] M. G. Rajar et al, (2004), *cond-mat/0501085*.
  - [6] C. L. Kane and M. P. A. Fisher, *Phys. Rev. B* 46, 15233 (1992).
  - [7] C. Chamion, M. Oshikawa, and I. A. A. Eck, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 91, 206404 (2003).
  - [8] F. Guinea, R. A. Jalabert, and F. Sols, *Phys. Rev. B* 70, 085310 (2004).
  - [9] F. Guinea, *Phys. Rev. B* 71, 045424 (2005).
  - [10] F. Guinea, *Phys. Rev. B* 67, 045103 (2003).
  - [11] L. Balents et al, (2004), *cond-mat/0408329*.
  - [12] S. Bulgadaev, *Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* 39, 264 (1984), *JETP Lett.* 39, 315 (1984).
  - [13] F. Guinea, V. Hakim, and A. Muramatsu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 54, 263 (1985).
  - [14] C. G. Callan, A. G. Felbe, and D. E. Freed, *Nucl. Phys. B* 392, 551 (1993).
  - [15] D. Hofstadter, *Phys. Rev. B* 14, 2239 (1976).
  - [16] D. Langbein, *Phys. Rev.* 180, 633 (1969).
  - [17] P. G. Harper, *Proc. Phys. Soc. London* 68, 874 (1955).
  - [18] H. Yi and C. L. Kane, *Phys. Rev. B* 57, R5579 (1998).
  - [19] I. A. Eck, M. Oshikawa, and H. Saleur, *Nucl. Phys. B* 594, 535 (2001).
  - [20] G. Gom ez-Santos, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 76, 4223 (1996).
  - [21] F. Guinea, *Phys. Rev. B* 32, 7518 (1985).
  - [22] E. Novais and F. Guinea and A. H. C. Neto, unpublished.
  - [23] G. Zaránd and E. Demler, *Phys. Rev. B* 66, 024427 (2002).
  - [24] A. H. C. Neto et al, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 91, 096401 (2003).
  - [25] The conclusion that the particle is delocalized for this parameter is in agreement with Ref. [4].