

Branch-cut Singularities in Thermodynamics of Fermi Liquid Systems.

Arkady Shekhter and Alexander M. Finkel'stein

Department of Condensed Matter Physics, The Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot, 76100, Israel
(Dated: Published in Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 103, 15765 (2006).)

The recently measured spin susceptibility of the two dimensional electron gas exhibits a strong dependence on temperature, which is incompatible with the standard Fermi liquid phenomenology. Here we show that the observed temperature behavior is inherent to ballistic two dimensional electrons. Besides the single-particle and collective excitations, the thermodynamics of Fermi liquid systems includes effects of the branch-cut singularities originating from the edges of the continuum of pairs of quasiparticles. As a result of the rescattering induced by interactions, the branch-cut singularities generate non-analyticities in the thermodynamic potential which reveal themselves in anomalous temperature dependences. Calculation of the spin susceptibility in such a situation requires a non-perturbative treatment of the interactions. As in high-energy physics, a mixture of the collective excitations and pairs of quasiparticles can be effectively described by a pole in the complex momentum plane. This analysis provides a natural explanation for the observed temperature dependence of the spin susceptibility, both in sign and magnitude.

The temperature dependences of the thermodynamic quantities in the Fermi liquid have been originally attributed to the smearing of the quasiparticle distribution near the Fermi surface [1]. This yields a relatively weak, quadratic in temperature, effect. A contribution of collective excitations, which in dimensions larger than one has a small phase space has been ignored. There is a lacuna in this picture. Both the single-particle and collective excitations are described by poles in the corresponding correlation functions. However, besides the poles there are branch-cut singularities originating from the edges of the continuum of pairs of quasiparticles. Such branch-cut singularities have not been given adequate attention in the theory of Fermi liquid systems. In the Fermi liquid theory, a rescattering of pairs of quasiparticles is considered for the description of the collective excitations which exist under certain conditions. This is not all that the rescattering of pairs does. Regardless of the existence (or absence) of the collective modes, the excitations near the edges of the continuum cannot be treated as independent as a consequence of the rescattering. The thermodynamics of Fermi liquid systems is not exhausted by the contributions of the single-particle and collective excitations. In interacting systems, as a

result of the multiple rescattering, the branch-cut singularities generate anomalous temperature dependences in the thermodynamic potential.

Motivated by recent measurements in the silicon metal-oxide-semiconductor field-effect transistors (Si-MOSFETs) [2], we study here the temperature dependence of the spin susceptibility, $\chi(T)$, in the two dimensional (2D) electron gas in the ballistic regime. Experiment indicates that in the metallic range of densities and for temperatures exceeding the elastic scattering rate, $T > 1/\tau_{el}$, the electrons in Si-MOSFET behave as an isotropic Fermi liquid with moderately strong interactions. In particular, the Shubnikov-de Haas oscillations both without and with an in-plane magnetic field indicate clearly the existence of a Fermi surface [3, 4, 5]. The only observation [2] incompatible with the simple Fermi liquid phenomenology is a surprisingly strong temperature dependence of $\chi(T)$. This behavior occurs in a wide range of densities that rules out proximity to a $T = 0$ quantum critical point as an explanation of the observed temperature effect. In this Report we show that such a temperature behavior of the spin susceptibility is inherent to 2D ballistic electrons. We explain the experiment by means of anomalous linear in T terms [6] generated by the electron-electron (e-e) interactions in $\chi(T)$. In recent papers, linear in T terms have been studied intensely within perturbation theory [7, 8, 9, 10, 11]. However, these works predict the susceptibility increasing with temperature, while the trend observed in the experiment is opposite. Taken seriously, this discrepancy indicates that we encounter a non-perturbative phenomenon. Here we show that a consistent treatment of the effect of rescattering of pairs of quasiparticles in different channels provides an explanation of the observed temperature dependence of $\chi(T)$.

How anomalous temperature terms are generated in spin susceptibility. Technically, the multiple rescattering of pairs of quasiparticles is represented by ladder diagrams where each section describes a propagation of a pair of quasiparticles between the rescattering events; see Fig. 1. The collective excitations reveal themselves as pole singularities in the ladder diagrams. When the pole enters into the continuum of two-particle excitations, collective excitation decay. Each of the intermediate sections in the ladder diagrams carries two branch-point singularities which reflect the edges of the continuum of pairs of quasiparticles. Therefore the correlation function describing a free propagation of a pair of quasiparticles has a branch cut. The analysis of the

effects of the branch-cut singularities on temperature dependences in the thermodynamic potential is the object of this Report. In the thermodynamic potential the contribution of the processes of multiple rescattering is given by the so-called ring diagrams, i.e., a series of closed ladder diagrams. For the ladder diagrams, the constraints imposed by the conservation of the momentum and energy are most effective because they are applied to a minimal number of quasiparticles. In this way, the dominant terms are generated in the thermodynamic potential. Otherwise summations over a large number of intermediate states smear out the singularities generated by the rescattering processes.




FIG. 1: The diagram illustrating two rescattering events. Lines connecting the interaction amplitudes are called a "section". Sections represent a propagation of a pair of quasiparticles between rescatterings. Depending on the direction of the arrows (omitted here) the section may represent the propagation of particle-hole (p-h) or particle-particle (Cooper) pairs.

We have to consider series of the ring diagrams in three different channels, i.e., in the particle-hole (p-h), the particle-particle (Cooper), and the $2k_F$ -scattering channels. The first two channels are standard for Fermi liquid theory. The third one is mostly known in connection with the Kohn anomaly in the polarization operator [12]. We start by analyzing the anomalous temperature terms in the p-h channel. Within Fermi liquid theory, the e-e interaction amplitude depends on the angle between the incoming and outgoing directions of a scattered particle and 0 and is commonly described in terms of the angular harmonics. To understand how the anomalous temperature terms are generated in the spin susceptibility, let us assume for a moment that the zero harmonic, 0 , dominates the interaction amplitude; $= ^0$. In the case of a single harmonic, propagation of a p-h pair is described by the angular averaged dynamic correlation function, $S_0 = \hbar S(\omega) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{(\omega + i0)^2}{(\omega + i0)^2 + (q v_F)^2}$, where $= g_B (1 + \epsilon_0) \hbar$ is the spin split energy induced by an external magnetic field H and $(1 + \epsilon_0)$ describes the Fermi

liquid renormalization of the g-factor. The function S_0 is imaginary when (for a given momentum) the frequency lies within the continuum of the particle-hole excitations. The edges of the particle-hole continuum reveal themselves in S_0 as a branch-point singularities. Since the position of the branch cut $|\omega| + \epsilon_0 < v_F q$ depends on the magnetic field, the magnetization of the electron gas becomes sensitive to the analytical properties of the two-particle correlation function near the edge of the continuum. The series of ladder diagrams describing the rescattering of p-h pairs generates the following term in the magnetization (for derivation see Eqs. (12) and (13) in the Appendix):

$$M = \frac{d!}{2} \coth \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{q dq}{\omega^2 + (q v_F)^2} \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{\omega^2 + (q v_F)^2}}; \quad (1)$$

where $\omega = \omega + i0$; we temporarily put $g_B (1 + \epsilon_0) = 2$ equal to one. Besides the branch-cut singularities originating from the particle-hole continuum, the expression in Eq. 1 exhibits a pole generated by $\frac{1}{\omega^2 + (q v_F)^2}$, which determines the spectrum of the collective excitations, i.e., the spin-wave excitations [14]. Note that the expansion, either in ω or in q , destroys the subtle structure of the denominator changing its analytical properties. Obviously, we encounter a non-perturbative phenomenon.

In the case of a weak magnetic field, $\epsilon_0 < T$, the collective excitations and the continuum of particle-hole excitations are not well-separated. Therefore, calculations of the thermodynamic quantities, e.g., magnetization, should be performed with care as the contributions from the collective and single-particle excitations are not independent. Performing the q -integration by contours in the complex q -plane (one should keep in mind that the analytical properties in the ω -plane differ from that in the q -plane), we find that this mixture of excitations is effectively captured by a pole in the complex momentum plane. This finding is reminiscent of the Regge pole description of the scattering processes in high-energy physics [15]. For $\epsilon_0 \neq 0$, the q -integral is non-vanishing only when the pole in the complex q -plane (a footprint of the spin-wave excitations) moves into the imaginary axis.[†] This move occurs within an interval $\epsilon_0 < \omega < \epsilon_0 + T = (1 + \epsilon_0) T$. At small T this interval has a width $\sim T$ that, by the way, explains why in $\partial M / \partial H$ we cannot set T to zero. Only after the q -integration, we get for M an expression which (at non-zero T) is regular

We work with the dimensionless static amplitudes known in Fermi liquid theory [13] as $\frac{k}{n}$, while the propagation of a p-h pair is described by the dynamic correlation function $S(\omega) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{(\omega + i0)^2}{(\omega + i0)^2 + (q v_F \cos \theta)^2}$; see Eq. 7 in the Appendix. Repulsion corresponds to $\frac{k}{n} > 0$, and Pomerenchuk's instability is at $\frac{k}{n} \rightarrow 1$.

[†] An alternative calculation without referring to the complex q -plane is presented in Appendix.

both in and :

$$M = \frac{Z}{2F} \frac{(1+)}{(!+)} \coth \frac{!}{2} d! ; \quad (2)$$

where is the density of states (per spin) at the Fermi surface. Expanding in , we obtain a linear in T correction in the spin susceptibility:

$$\chi_{ph} = 2 \frac{T}{F} \ln \frac{1}{1+} + \frac{1}{1+} : \quad (3)$$

A comment is in order here. At first glance, a linear in T term in $\chi(T)$ cannot be reconciled with the third law of thermodynamics, $S_{T \rightarrow 0} = 0$, in view of the Maxwell relation $(\partial M / \partial T)_H = (\partial S / \partial H)_T$. This observation is the core of the statement on the textbook level that the paramagnetic behavior with $\chi \propto T + \text{const}$ cannot exist at sufficiently low temperature; see e.g. Ref. [16]. The well known vanishing of the coefficient of thermal expansion at the absolute zero has the same origin. In this kind of argumentation, it is indirectly assumed that the thermodynamic potential has a regular expansion in both of its arguments around $H; T = 0$.² In fact, Eq. 2 demonstrates that the magnetization $M = TH_m$ ($H=T$) has a strong dependence on the order of limits $H; T \rightarrow 0$. We see from Eq. 2 that $M \propto HT$ when $T > H$; but for $T < H$ the temperature dependence disappears and $M \propto H^2$. The solution to the conflict with the third law of thermodynamics is that the magnetic field range over which $M \propto H$ shrinks to zero as $T \rightarrow 0$, and M acquires a non-linear in H behavior outside this range. At $T \rightarrow 0$, which unavoidably brings us into the region $T < H$, the only indisputable condition imposed by the third law is limited to vanishing of $(\partial M / \partial T)_H$. Evidently, Eq. 2 complies with this requirement at $T=H \rightarrow 0$. Therefore, the existence of a linear in T correction in the spin susceptibility is legitimate and may persist down to $T \rightarrow 0$, provided that $T > H$.

Why spin susceptibility decreases with temperature. The spin susceptibility as given by Eq. 3 contradicts the experiment. According to Eq. 3 the spin susceptibility should increase with T, while in the experiment it decreases. Below we offer a resolution to this puzzle. We would like first to indicate a subtlety in the thermodynamic potential term with two rescattering sections (i.e., in the term proportional to ²; see Fig. 2. Obviously in the ring diagrams the number of sections is equal to the number of the interaction amplitudes). We show below

that the term ² in the spin susceptibility is heavily dominated by the scattering sharply peaked near the backward direction, $\theta = \pi$ (throughout the paper the term "backward scattering" will be used to refer to this process). This fact leads to far reaching physical consequences, because the diagram with two rescattering sections dominated by backward scattering can be read in three different ways. Such a diagram can be twisted so as to also describe the rescattering in the Cooper channel^{*} or two sections in the $2k_F$ -scattering channel; see Fig. 2 for explanations. Therefore, overlapping of all three channels takes place. In order to explain the sign of the effect, it is necessary to simultaneously consider different channels and to avoid the double counting of the contributions generated by different channels. This is the central point in our calculation of $\chi(T)$.

Before proceeding further, let us outline the consequences of the overlapping of the three channels which takes place on the level of two rescattering sections. Instead of counting the term ² in the p-h channel, we count it within the Cooper channel where it eventually gets killed off by logarithmic renormalizations of the interaction amplitudes. Therefore, we have to subtract the two-section term from χ_{ph} in Eq. 3 which includes it along with higher order terms. As a result of this subtraction Eq. 3 has to be replaced by Eqs. (5) and (6) below. In the rest of this section we give the details of this procedure.

Let us first show how the backward scattering arises in two p-h rescattering sections. This requires a calculation of $\chi(T)$ in which the full harmonic content of (χ_0) is included. When the amplitudes u_n and u_m with different harmonics n and m are involved, the propagation of the p-h pair between the rescattering events is described by the dynamical correlation functions $S_{nm} = [(1 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{(q-q')^2}) v_F q]^{n-m} S_0$. Despite the nontrivial dependence of S_{nm} on the harmonics indices, the contribution to $\chi(T)$ in the second order of e-e interaction amplitudes acquires a very simple form :

$$\chi_{(2)} = \frac{T}{F} \sum_{nm} X (1)^{n+m} u_n u_m : \quad (4)$$

Because $\sum_n (1)^n u_n$ is equal to the backward scattering amplitude $\chi_{(1)}$, this contribution reduces to $\chi_{(2)} =$

² We are not aware of a similar discussion of the thermal expansion coefficient (as well as elastic constants) at low temperatures. In the context of the spin susceptibility the question has been raised by Misawa [17] who guessed (incorrectly) a non analytic form of the thermodynamic potential.

^{*} In fact, an arbitrary number of rescattering sections appears in the Cooper channel after such twisting, but only two of them are used here for the extraction of the anomalous in temperature terms. The role of all other sections is to renormalize logarithmically the e-e interaction amplitudes in the Cooper channel. In the text, we refer the term "section" in the Cooper channel only to those of them that generate linear in T terms. This allows us to speak simultaneously about two sections and the renormalized e-e amplitudes without confusion.




FIG. 2: The diagrams at the top present the ring diagrams in the electron-hole channel. Left diagram shows the two-section term which is controlled by the backward scattering; them on entry in the four Green's functions are along the same direction: $1; 2 + k_F$ and $3; 4 - k_F$. The Green functions are numbered to keep track of them after the rearrangement in different channels. Right diagram at the bottom shows how the two-section term can be read in the $2k_F$ -channel. Here the shaded areas represent the interaction amplitudes in the $2k_F$ -channel. The lines inside the shaded areas are drawn to clarify the spin structure and to indicate the source of the relevant renormalizations. Left diagrams at the bottom show the result of twisting of the two-section term into the Cooper channel. In the series of the Cooper ladder diagrams obtained in this way only two sections (marked by numbered Green's functions) are responsible for the linear in T term in the spin susceptibility. The role of all other sections is to renormalize logarithmically the $e-e$ interaction amplitudes.

$(T = T_F)^{-2}(\gamma)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. We have checked that exactly the same result can be obtained by the calculation of two rescattering sections in the Cooper channel, or in the $2k_F$ -channel. In the calculation of the Cooper channel, we use the angular harmonics of the particle-particle correlation functions. Once again, despite the nontrivial dependence of these correlation functions on their harmonics indices, the result reduces to the backward scattering amplitude; details will be published elsewhere [18]. Moreover, this calculation yields the same coefficient as in Eq. 4. In the case of the $2k_F$ -channel the presence of $(\gamma)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ in Eq. 4 is evident, but one has to check the coefficient. On the level of two rescattering sections the contributions generated in three channels coincide (i.e., in (2) all three channels overlap), as we described above.

We now analyze the problem of the renormalizations of the linear in T terms. It is easy to check that unlike the case of one-dimensional electrons [19], the higher order terms in the $2k_F$ -scattering channel are not important in 2D. Therefore, we will not discuss this channel fur-

ther and concentrate on the interplay between the other two channels. Up to this point, the interaction amplitudes have played a rather passive role in our calculations. The peak near the backward scattering direction has been generated by the dynamic correlation functions describing the propagation of pairs of particles in each of the channels. The interaction amplitudes have simply supplied a featureless coefficient $(\gamma)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ in the two-section term. To understand the true role of the $e-e$ interaction in the anomalous temperature corrections we have to abandon the central assumption of the microscopic Fermi liquid theory that different sections in the ladder diagrams are independent. Indeed, when the rescattering is dominated by the backward scattering, a strong dependence of the interaction amplitude on its arguments in the $p-h$ channel emerges from the logarithms in the Cooper channel (this is a weak version of the parquet known for one-dimensional electrons [19]). In view of this circumstance, in the case of two rescattering sections we have to take into consideration the dependence of the scattering amplitude $(p; p+q+k; p+k; p+q)$ on the arguments q and k . We resolve the problem of the logarithm by moving the term with two rescattering sections to the Cooper channel where the logarithmic renormalizations originate. This move is possible because the terms with two sections in different channels coincide. Note also that as a result of moving the two-section term to the Cooper channel we avoid the double counting of the two-section term in three different channels. After this step, as we discussed earlier, the contribution to the spin susceptibility from the $p-h$ channel becomes

$$\chi^0 = \chi_{p-h}^{(2)} : \quad (5)$$

We now consider the contribution to the spin susceptibility from the Cooper channel. The rescattering in the Cooper channel leads to the logarithmic renormalizations of the interaction amplitudes $C_n(T) = C_n = (1 + C_n \ln T_F/T)$ where C_n are harmonics of the amplitude in the Cooper channel. At sufficiently small temperatures, the repulsive amplitudes, $C_n > 0$, vanish as $C_n(T) \rightarrow 1 = \ln(T_F/T)$. (We do not consider here the developing of the instability for the attractive amplitudes [18] as it is most likely blocked by the disorder in the system studied in Ref. [2].) Therefore, the linear in T terms generated in the Cooper channel are suppressed at low temperatures. Coming back to the discussion preceding Eq. 5, we now see that the logarithmic renormalization of the amplitudes in the term with two rescattering sections in the $p-h$ channel results in full elimination of this term at low enough temperatures. Therefore, for the repulsive $e-e$ interaction when only zero harmonic is kept, the temperature dependence of the spin susceptibility is given by

$$\chi = 2 \frac{T}{T_F} \chi^0 = 2 + \ln \frac{1}{1 + \frac{T}{T_F}} + \frac{1}{1 + \frac{T}{T_F}} : \quad (6)$$

[†] A calculation with the use of angular harmonics has been performed in [11] for the anomalous terms in the specific heat; it also leads to the backward scattering amplitude $(\gamma)^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

In contrast to the previous calculations, this result provides the sign of the temperature dependence of the spin susceptibility which coincides with that observed experimentally [2]. The expression in Eq. 6 has been obtained by summation of the ladder diagrams in two channels and taking into consideration the overlap of the two-section term. In this way we resolve the puzzle of the sign of the temperature trend in $\chi(T)$.

We next note that the intervention of the Cooper renormalizations in the p-h channel is effective only for the term with two rescattering sections. We have checked that the situation with a dominant role of the backward scattering is not general and it does not occur for terms with more than two rescattering sections. A direct calculation of the term with three interaction amplitudes $\chi^{(3)} = (T = F) \chi^{(1,2,3)} \chi^{(1,2)} \chi^{(2,3)} \chi^{(3,1)} d_1 d_2 d_3$, performed with the use of the methods sketched above, shows that there is only a weak (logarithmic) singularity near the backward scattering. This is far weaker than the sharp δ -function peak near the backward direction, $\delta = 0$, in the case of two rescattering sections. It is therefore safe to conclude that, unlike the case of the two-section term, the logarithmic renormalizations are ineffective for three and more sections in the p-h channel.




FIG. 3: The experimental data for $n = \chi$ expressed in K and depicted as a function of temperature. χ is the spin susceptibility determined from $H = 0.7T$ spin magnetization; n is the density of the 2D electron gas in Si-MOSFET. Numbers in the inset are density of the corresponding curves in units of 10^{10} cm^{-2} . Only a fragment of the data of Ref. [2] corresponding to the ballistic electrons is presented. [Data courtesy of M. Reznikov (Technion, Haifa), used with permission.]

Relation to experiment. Finally, let us discuss the result of our analysis in connection with the measurement of the spin susceptibility in Si-MOSFET [2]. In Fig. 3 the data for a quantity $n = \chi$ are presented, where n is the density of the 2D electron gas. We focus here on the curves corresponding to the ballistic range of the

densities. These curves exhibit a noticeable rise with temperature at $T = 1.5 \text{ K}$, which is too strong for the conventional Fermi liquid theory; the conventional Fermi liquid temperature dependence will be invisible on scales used in the plot of Fig. 3. The data correspond to the range of densities and temperatures where the transport is ballistic. The rising curves in this plot indicate that the spin susceptibility decreases with temperature. We assume here that this temperature dependence is due to the term given by Eq. 6, which we multiply by the factor 4 to account for two valleys. At lower temperatures the discussed effect of the anomalous temperature corrections is cut-off by disorder. One can expand $n = \chi$ with respect to the temperature corrections: $(n = \chi) = T f(\epsilon)$, where $f(\epsilon) = 2 \ln(1 + \epsilon) + (1 + \epsilon)$. The modification of the spin susceptibility by the Stoner factor $(1 + \epsilon)$ drops out from $(n = \chi)$. It is cancelled by the two factors $(1 + \epsilon)$ in χ ignored so far because in the definition of the combination $g_B(1 + \epsilon) = 2$ has been put equal to one. The main advantage of the combination $(n = \chi)$ is that its temperature dependence is determined by the dimensionless interaction amplitudes only. In the discussed range of densities, parameter r_s is about 3-4 (r_s is the ratio of the energy of the e-e interaction to the kinetic energy). Therefore, one may expect the dimensionless interaction amplitudes to have a magnitude ~ 1 . Perhaps even a few leading harmonics may be involved. For $n \notin 0$ harmonics enter in pairs, $n = n$, and consequently $f(\epsilon)$ should be slightly modified because of mixing between n and n ; see Appendix for details. When the amplitude ~ 1 the function $f(\epsilon)$ is of order unity (e.g., for $\epsilon = 1.5$ it is equal to 0.7). The slope of the curves $(n = \chi)$ presented in Fig. 3 is also ~ 1 , i.e., of the same order of magnitude. Together these facts support our conclusion that at low temperature the sign and the magnitude of the temperature dependence of the spin susceptibility can be explained by the theory of the anomalous corrections presented in this Report. At temperatures comparable with the Fermi energy the logarithmic suppression of the interaction amplitudes in the (2) -term should become ineffective. If so, when $1 = \ln(F = T)$ & the temperature dependence will change sign leading to a non-monotonic spin susceptibility. Unfortunately, the temperature range of the existing measurement, $T = F = 0.1$, does not allow to verify this consequence of our theory.

To conclude, the thermodynamics of Fermi liquid systems is not exhausted by the contributions of the single-particle and collective excitations. These two types of the excitations are described by the poles in the corresponding correlation functions. However, the theory of Fermi liquid systems is not complete without consideration of the branch-cut singularities. In interacting systems, as a result of the rescattering of quasiparticles, the branch-cut singularities generate non-analyticities in the thermodynamic potential which reveal themselves in anomalous temperature dependences. The observed tem-

perature dependence in the spin susceptibility of the 2D electron gas can be explained in this way. The mechanism determining the sign of the anomalous terms in the spin susceptibility discussed here may have implications for the physics near the quantum critical point at the ferromagnetic instability.

APPENDIX

Here we present the details of the calculation of the anomalous temperature corrections to the spin susceptibility originating from the particle-hole (p-h) channel. The propagation of the pair of the quasiparticles with the opposite spin projections in the p-h channel is described (see x 17 in ref. 13 in the main text) by the two-particle correlation function $[GG]_{q; \uparrow \downarrow}$; $= \langle G(\uparrow) G(\downarrow) \rangle$, where $\uparrow = p + q$, $\downarrow = p - q$. Here $\uparrow = 2h$ is the relative shift of the chemical potential equal to the Zeeman energy splitting; $h = (g_B/2)B$. It is convenient to single out the dynamical part of this correlation function:

$$[GG]_{q; \uparrow \downarrow} = \frac{1}{v_F q} + S(q; \uparrow \downarrow); \quad S(q; \uparrow \downarrow) = \frac{1}{1 + v_F q \cos \theta} \quad (7)$$

In this work, the static part of $[GG]_{q; \uparrow \downarrow}$ is absorbed in the static Fermi-liquid amplitudes A^k and will be not considered further. The propagation of a p-h pair is described by the dynamical correlation function $S(\uparrow \downarrow)$. (From now on, we will omit v_F in the product $v_F q$ and consider q as measured in energy units.)

Let us first calculate the contribution from the two rescattering sections in the p-h channel to the anomalous term in the thermodynamic potential:

$$\chi_2(\omega) = \sum_{n, m} \frac{A_n^k A_m^k}{4} \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d! \coth \frac{!}{2} \text{Im} S_{n-m}(q; \uparrow \downarrow) S_{m-n}(q; \uparrow \downarrow) \quad (8)$$

Because the amplitudes with different harmonics n and m are involved, the propagation of the p-h pair is described by the angular harmonics of the two-particle correlation function, $S_{n-m} = (d/2) S(\uparrow \downarrow) e^{i(n-m)\theta}$, where

$$S_0 = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{!}{v_F^2} \frac{!}{q^2}} \quad S_{\neq 0} = \frac{!}{q} \frac{1}{1 + \frac{!}{v_F^2} \frac{!}{q^2}} S_0 \quad (9)$$

Here we introduce $! = ! + i0$. Integration over q can be done by contours in the complex q plane. This leads to the following frequency integral:

$$\chi_2(\omega) = \sum_{n, m} \frac{A_n^k A_m^k}{16} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d! \frac{!}{2} \coth \frac{!}{2} \text{sign} ! \quad (10)$$

Performing the frequency integration for the spin susceptibility $\chi = \chi^2 = \chi^2$ we come to Eq. 4 in the main text:

$$\chi_2 = \frac{T}{F} \sum_{n, m} \frac{A_n^k A_m^k}{16} \quad (11)$$

We now calculate the ladder diagrams in the p-h channel. We start with the zero harmonic; $\chi_0 = \chi_0$. For completeness we will do it in two different ways. The contribution to the thermodynamic potential is equal to

$$\chi_0 = \sum_{n, m} \frac{A_n^k A_m^k}{16} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d! \coth \frac{!}{2} \text{Im} \ln \frac{1}{1 + \frac{!}{v_F^2} \frac{!}{q^2}} \quad (12)$$

Here we assume that the frequency $!$ is slightly shifted above the real axis. Eq. 1 in the main text for the magnetization $M = \chi = \chi$ follows immediately from this expression. To proceed further, we observe that $!$ and q enter in Eq. 12 only through the combination $!^2/q^2$. Therefore the expression inside the integral vanishes under the action of $!^{-1} \partial/\partial ! + q^{-1} \partial/\partial q$. We use this to write the magnetization $M = \chi = \chi$ as an integral of the full derivative

$$M = \sum_{n, m} \frac{A_n^k A_m^k}{16} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d! \coth \frac{!}{2} \frac{!}{2} \frac{1}{! + \frac{!}{v_F^2} \frac{!}{q^2}} \quad (13)$$

Collecting the contribution at the lower limit of the q integral, we obtain

$$M = \sum_{n, m} \frac{A_n^k A_m^k}{16} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d! \coth \frac{!}{2} \frac{!}{2} \text{Im} \ln \frac{!}{! + !} \quad (14)$$

Here we have used that $\frac{!}{!^2} \frac{!}{q^2} \frac{!}{q} \Big|_{q=0} = !$, which corresponds to the correct analytical structure of the square root function in S_0 and S_1 . For $!$ slightly above the real axis we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{for } ! > 0 \quad \text{Im} \ln \frac{! + \frac{!}{v_F^2} \frac{!}{q^2}}{(! + 1)! + \frac{!}{v_F^2} \frac{!}{q^2}} &= 0; & \text{otherwise} &= \frac{!}{1+!} \\ \text{for } ! < 0 \quad \text{Im} \ln \frac{! + \frac{!}{v_F^2} \frac{!}{q^2}}{(! + 1)! + \frac{!}{v_F^2} \frac{!}{q^2}} &= 0; & \text{otherwise} &= \frac{!}{1+!} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

As a consequence of taking an imaginary part, the frequency integration is restricted to a narrow frequency interval around zero. As a result we obtain Eq. 2 of the main text:

$$M = \frac{1}{2F} \sum_{n, m} \frac{A_n^k A_m^k}{16} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d! \coth \frac{!}{2} \frac{!}{2} \quad (16)$$

It is instructive to reproduce the same result by a more powerful (but also more delicate) method of the integration by contours in the complex q plane. We return to the expression for magnetization M :

$$M = \left(\frac{2}{\pi} \right) \int_0^Z dq \coth \frac{q}{2} \int_0^1 \frac{q dq}{2} \frac{1}{(t^2 + q^2) \left(1 + \frac{t^2}{t^2 + q^2} \right)} : \quad (17)$$

An important property of this expression is that apart from the branch cut on the real axes it also has poles in the complex q plane originating from zeros of $1 + \frac{t^2}{t^2 + q^2}$. Solving the equation $1 + \frac{t^2}{t^2 + q^2} = 0$ we find that the poles never appear inside the branch cut in the complex q plane (the branch-cuts are along the real axis, covering $|q| > t$). The poles are either somewhere on the real axes between $-t$ and t or appear as a pair on the imaginary axis. For $t > 0$ the poles exist if $\frac{2}{\pi} < 1 < 0$. They are imaginary for $\frac{2}{\pi} < 1 < \frac{2}{\pi} = (1 + \frac{2}{\pi})$. For $\frac{2}{\pi} < 0$ the imaginary poles exist for $\frac{2}{\pi} = (1 + \frac{2}{\pi}) < 1 < \frac{2}{\pi}$. We see that the conditions that the poles are on the imaginary axes lead to the same intervals as in Eq. 15 above.

The expression under the integral in Eq. 17 is an odd function of q . This allows us to rewrite the q integral as a contour integral in the complex q plane. The contour consists of two lines going in the opposite direction above and below the real axis. More specifically, the part of the contour below the real axis goes in the positive direction when $t > 0$ and in the negative direction when $t < 0$. Thus,

$$M = \left(\frac{2}{\pi} \right) \int_0^Z dq \coth \frac{q}{2} \int_C \frac{q dq}{2} \frac{1}{(t^2 + q^2) \left(1 + \frac{t^2}{t^2 + q^2} \right)} : \quad (18)$$

When there are no poles, or they are present but located on the real axis q , the integral vanishes. (The contour C can be deformed to a big circle where the function under the integral drops as $1/q^2$.) However, the integral does not vanish if the poles are on the imaginary axis in the complex q plane. This occurs only for the frequency intervals discussed above. By deforming the contour and taking the residue we reproduce the Eq. 2 in the main text.

So far, only one harmonic in the scattering amplitude has been iterated within the ring diagrams. Moreover, for the purpose of clarity it has been assumed that zero harmonic amplitude a_0 is dominant leading to Eq. 6 in the main text. When $n \neq 0$; harmonics enter in pairs because harmonic amplitudes for n are equal, $a_n = a_{-n}$. When different harmonics are involved, the segments representing the iterated harmonics $a_n = a_{-n} = (1 + \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{1}{1 + \frac{2}{\pi}} \frac{1}{q^2})$ have to be connected by

a correlation function S_{n-m} which represents the "transition section" from n to m . For a particular case of a pair of harmonics n , the transition section is S_{2n} . The summation of the ring diagrams for $n \neq 0$ can be performed by counting how many times the section S_{2n} appears

$$(n; n) = \left(\frac{2}{\pi} \right) \int_0^Z dq \coth \frac{q}{2} \int_1^{\infty} \frac{q dq}{2} \ln \frac{1}{\hat{a}_n S_{2n} \hat{a}_n S_{2n}} : \quad (19)$$

In the following we will limit ourselves to the first mixing term in which the transition section S_{2n} appears two times; this is reasonable when $n = 1$. For clarity, we will denote a_n as a . Then,

$$(a; a) = \left(\frac{2}{\pi} \right) \int_0^Z dq \coth \frac{q}{2} \int_1^{\infty} \frac{q dq}{2} \frac{1}{\left(1 + \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{1}{1 + \frac{2}{\pi}} \frac{1}{q^2} \right) \left(1 + \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{1}{1 + \frac{2}{\pi}} \frac{1}{q^2} \right)} : \quad (20)$$

The q integral is evaluated by contours in the complex q plane

$$(a; a) = \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{T}{2_F} + \dots (a; a); \quad (21)$$

$$(a; a) = \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{2}{\pi} \right) + \dots \int_1^{\infty} \frac{q dq}{2} \frac{1}{d! \frac{2}{\pi} \coth \frac{q}{2} \left(\frac{1}{1 + \frac{2}{\pi}} \right) \left(\frac{1}{1 + \frac{2}{\pi}} \right)} \frac{1}{1 + \frac{2}{\pi}} \frac{1}{1 + \frac{2}{\pi}} \frac{1}{q^2} : \quad (22)$$

The first term $(a; a)$ is a part of the two section term which reduces to the square of the backward scattering amplitude. It gets killed by the logarithmic renormalizations in the Cooper channel as it has been discussed in the main text; we will not keep this term anymore. The other term in Eq. 21 is determined by the poles of $1/(1 + \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{1}{1 + \frac{2}{\pi}} \frac{1}{q^2})$ when they are on the imaginary axis. After passing to a new variable $x = (1 + \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{1}{1 + \frac{2}{\pi}} \frac{1}{q^2}) = 1 + \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{1}{1 + \frac{2}{\pi}} \frac{1}{q^2}$ we obtain in the limit

$$(a; a) = \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{T}{2_F} + \frac{n(a; a)}{(1 + \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{1}{1 + \frac{2}{\pi}} \frac{1}{q^2})}; \quad (23)$$

where the function describing the mixing of two harmonics is

$$n(a; a) = \frac{2}{1 + \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{1}{1 + \frac{2}{\pi}} \frac{1}{q^2}} \int_0^Z dx \frac{1}{1 + \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{1}{1 + \frac{2}{\pi}} \frac{1}{q^2}} \frac{1}{1 + \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{1}{1 + \frac{2}{\pi}} \frac{1}{q^2}} : \quad (24)$$

The last factor reduces the numerical value of n so that the correction from the mixing of harmonics is noticeable

mostly for first few harmonics with $n \leq 1$. Using the fact that the magnitude of amplitudes a_n and b_n is equal, we obtain

$$= 2 (T_F)^2 \frac{d_n (a_n)}{d_n} : \quad (25)$$

Finally, we obtain for a pair of non-zero harmonics n

$$\chi_{n \neq 0} = 2 (T_F)^2 \left(f(a_n) + f(b_n) + \frac{d_n (a_n)}{d_n} \right) : \quad (26)$$

All terms on the right-hand side start with $\frac{1}{n^3}$. The last term describes the modification of the temperature term in the spin susceptibility for non-zero harmonics because of the mixing of a_n and b_n ; compare with Eq. 6 in the main text. At $\mu = 1$, the value $2f(\mu = 1) = 0.6$, whereas for $n = 1; 2; 10$ the corresponding values of $\frac{d_n (a_n)}{d_n} = d_n$ are 0.24; 0.16; 0.04.

A similar analysis can be performed for the term with three (or more) interaction amplitudes. We check in this way that for the higher order terms in the p-h channel the scattering does not reduce to the backward scattering. Therefore, there is no overlap with the Cooper channel, and the intervention of the Cooper channel is irrelevant here.

Acknowledgements: We thank M. Reznikov and C. Varn for valuable discussions. A.F. is supported by the Minerva Foundation.

Electronic address: E-mail: arcadi.shehter@weizmann.ac.il

[1] Landau, L.D. (1957) Sov. Phys. JETP 3, 920-925.

[2] Prus, O., Yaish, Y., Reznikov, M., Sivan, U., & Pudalov, V. (2003) Phys. Rev. B 67, 205407.

[3] Pudalov, V. M., Gershenson, M. E., Kojima, H., Butch, N., Dzhur, E. M., Brunthaler, G., Prinz, A., & Bauer, G. (2002) Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 196404.

[4] Shashkin, A. A., Rahini, M., Anissimova, S., Kravchenko, S. V., Dolgoplov, V. T., & Klapwijk, T. M. (2003) Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 046403.

[5] Anissimova, S., Venkatesan, A., Shashkin, A. A., Sakr, M. R., Kravchenko, S. V., & Klapwijk, T. M. (2006) Phys. Rev. Lett. 96, 046409.

[6] Belitz, D., Kirkpatrick, T. R., & Vojta, T. (1996) Phys. Rev. B 55, 9452-9462.

[7] Chubukov, A. V., & Maslov, D. L. (2003) Phys. Rev. B 68, 155113.

[8] Galitski, V. M., Chubukov, A. V., & DasSarma, S. (2005) Phys. Rev. B 71, 201302(R).

[9] Betouras, J., Efremov, D., & Chubukov, A. V. (2005) Phys. Rev. B 72, 115112.

[10] Chubukov, A. V., Maslov, D. L., Gangadharaiyah, S., & Glazman, L. I. (2005) Phys. Rev. Lett. 95, 026402.

[11] Chubukov, A. V., Maslov, D. L., & Millis, A. J. (2006) Phys. Rev. B 73, 045128.

[12] Stern, F. (1967) Phys. Rev. Lett. 18, 546.

[13] Landau, L. D., & Lifshitz, E. M. (1980) Course of Theoretical Physics, Vol. 9, Lifshitz, E. M., & Pitaevskii, L. P., Statistical Physics, Part 2 (Pergamon, Oxford).

[14] White, R. M. (1983) Quantum Theory of Magnetism. (Springer-Verlag, New York).

[15] Gribov, V. N. (2003) The Theory of Complex Angular Momenta (Cambridge University Press).

[16] Callen, H. B. (1960) Thermodynamics (John Wiley, New York).

[17] Misawa, S. (1999) J. Phys. Soc. Japan 68, 2172.

[18] Shekhter A., Finkelstein A. M. to appear in Phys. Rev. B (2006).

[19] Bychkov, A., Gorkov, L. P., & Dzyaloshinski, I. E. (1966) Zh. Eksp. Theor. Fiz. 50 738 [Sov. Phys. JETP 23 (1966) 489].