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#### Abstract

W e analyze how the range ofdisorder a ects the localization properties ofquasiparticles in a tw odim ensionald-w ave superconductorw ith in the standard non-linear modelapproach to disordered system s . We show that for purely long-range disorder, which only induces intra-node scattering processes, the approach is free from the am biguities w hich often beset the disordered $D$ irac-ferm ion theories, and gives rise to a W ess-Zum ino-N ovikov-W itten action leading to vanishing density of states and nite conductivities. W e also study the crossover induced by intemode scattering due to a short range com ponent of the disorder, thus providing a coherent non-linear m odeldescription in agreem ent with all the various ndings of di erent approaches.


PACS num bers: $7420 .-\mathrm{z}, 7425$ Fy, $71.23 \mathrm{An}, 72.15 \mathrm{Rn}, 74.72 \mathrm{~h}$
K eyw ords: D isordered system s (T heory), Sigm a m odels (T heory)

## I. INTRODUCTION

T he low -tem perature quasiparticle transport in tw o-dim ensionald-w ave superoonductors like cuprates is a fascinating issue due to the presence of four nodes in the energy spectrum of the B ogoliubov quasiparticles, around whidh the low-lying excitations have a D irac-like dispersion. W thin the self-consistent C oherent-P hase-A pproxim ation in the lim it of weak disorder, spin and them al conductivities are found to be related by a $W$ iedem ann Franz law and to acquire universalvahues which do not depend on the disorder strength $\frac{1}{6}$ Inclusion of quantum interference in the fram ew ork of the standard non-linear $m$ odel approach to disordered system $s^{2,3}$ leads to a variety of universality classes ${ }^{4}, 5,6,7,8,9,10,11$. In the \generic" case of short-ranged non $m$ agnetic im purities full localization of B ogoliubov quasiparticles is predicted ${ }^{5}$

Nevertheless, w ith the only exceptions of YBCO (124) ${ }^{12}$ and $\mathrm{Pr}_{2}{ }_{\mathrm{x}} \mathrm{Ce}_{\mathrm{x}} \mathrm{CuO}{ }_{4}{ }^{13}$, experi$m$ ents in cuprates $m$ aterials like YBCO (123) ${ }^{14,15,16}$, BSCCO (2212) ${ }^{15}$ and LSCO $\underline{17}$ do not show any evidence of strong or even weak localization in the superconducting phase dow $n$ to 0.1 K elvin. Various physicale ects m ay be invoked to explain the disagreem ent betw een theory and experim ents.

For instance one $m$ ay argue that the origin of the discrepancy are spin- ip scattering events, even though the system $s$ are nom inally free from $m$ agnetic im purities. Indeed, in the presence of spin- ips, the non-linear m odel predicts that quantum interference has a delocalizing e ecte. A ltematively, or in addition, strong dephasing processes might set the tem perature scale for the onset of localization e ects below the experim entally accessed region. This question has not been settled yet ${ }^{18}$. R esidual interactions am ong quasiparticles can also favor delocalization ${ }^{9,11}$, even though, in the weak disorder lim it, they are expected to be less e ective since their coupling is proportional to the density of states which, already in the Bom approxim ation, is very sm all.

A nother possible explanation invokes the range of the im purity potential. In the case of purely long range disorder, forw ard processes dom inate and scattering occurs m ainly w ithin each node. In the extrem e case of intra-node scattering only, it has been show $n^{19}, \underline{20}$ that the density of states behaves quite di erently from the isotropic-scattering case. In addition the eigenstates have been argued ${ }^{20}$ to be delocalized, unlike for short-range im purity potential. Even though realdisorder w illalw ays have an isotropic com ponent w hich provides scattering
am ong all four nodes, and eventually drive the system to localization, onem ight argue that a large value of the intranode w ith respect to the intemode scattering could low er the crossover tem perature for the appearance of localization precursore ects. A sizeable am ount of long range disorder has been indeed argued to be present in cuprates on the basis of STM and m icrow ave conductivity experim ents ${ }^{21}$. This is not surprising since superconducting cuprates are intrinsically disordered by the out-of-plane charge dopants which $m$ ainly provide a longrange disordered potential. Further doping with iso-valent im purities which substitute inplane Cu-ions only adds a short-range com ponent on top of the pre-existing long-range tail of the disordered potential.

The results in the presence of purely intra-node im purity scattering have been obtained ${ }^{19,20} \mathrm{w}$ thin an approach which is conceptually di erent from the standard non-linear $m$ odel approach to disordered system $s$. The latter starts from the Bom approxim ation, i.e. from im purity-dam ped quasiparticles, and treats perturbatively what is beyond that, ie. quantum interference e ects on the di usive $m$ otion. On the contrary, the altemative $m$ eth ods used in Refs. [19,20] do not rely on the Bom approxim ation but just $m$ ap the action of ballistic nodal-quasiparticles in the presence of disorder onto the action of one-dim ensional (1d) ferm ions in the presence of an interaction, which is generated by the disorder average. $W$ thin the $m$ apping, one of the tw o spatial dim ensions transform $s$ into the tim e coordinate of the 1 dm odel while the other into the 1d spatial coordinate. The nalmodel is then analyzed by abelian and non-abelian bosonization. The outcom e of this analysis is that for purely intra-node or inter-opposite-node disorder, where essentially exact results can be obtained ${ }^{19}, \underline{20}$, the density of states is pow er-law vanishing at the chem ical potentialw ith an exponent which is disorder-dependent in the form er case and universal in the latter. In both cases the results suggest that a di usive quasiparticle $m$ otion never sets in, nam ely quasiparticles $m$ ove ballistically down to zero energy. $W$ hen the disorder also couples adjacent nodes, strong coupling argum ents are invoked ${ }^{20}$ which predict localization of quasiparticles and linearly vanishing density of states. Yet, even this case seem $s$ to suggest a scenario in which quasiparticle $m$ otion from ballistic tums directly into localized w ithout crossing any interm ediate di usive regím e.

The standard non-linear model approach applies the replica tridk to average over disorder from the outset. The resulting ferm ion interaction is then decoupled by introducing $Q$ matrix elds in term $s$ of which an ective action is derived after integrating out the
ferm ions. The saddle point solution is just the B om approxim ation, which provides, in the case of nodal B ogoliubov quasiparticles, a nite density of states hence a nite dam ping. Finally, long-w avelength transverse uctuations are taken w ith respect to the saddle point leading to a non-linear $m$ odel action for the $Q \mathrm{~m}$ atrix elds. H ow ever, unlike in conventional disordered system $s$, in this particular case an additional term $m$ ay appear in the non-linear m odel action, nam ely a so-called $W$ ezz-Zum ino-N ovikov-W itten (W ZW ) term. It was actually arguedr, 20,22 that two opposite nodes share the sam eW ZW term, while two adjacent ones have opposite W ZW term s. A s a consequence, when the two pairs of opposite nodes are uncoupled by disorder the W ZW term is e ective and the -fiunction of the spin-conductance ow stow ards an interm ediate-ooupling xed point, signaling a delocalized behavior. On the contrary, when disorder couples all nodes together, the two W ZW term s cancel exactly and the non-linear $m$ odel has no m ore protection against ow ing tow ards a zero-conductance strong coupling regin e characterized by a linearly vanishing density of states ${ }^{6}$.

From the above discussion one $m$ ight be lead to conclude that the agreem ent betw een the conclusions draw $n$ w ith either $m$ ethods is $m$ erely an accident which does not justify per se the conventional non-linear $m$ odel approach when dealing $w$ th $D$ irac ferm ions. The $m$ ain ob jection against the conventional non-linear $m$ odel is that it is not appropriate to start from a sym metry breaking saddle-point solution, associated to a m ean- eld-like nite density of states, when the outcom e of including uctuations is a vanishing density of states. Put in a di erent language, it is hard to believe in a m ethod which starts by assum ing a di usive behavior if at the end it is discovered that a di usive regim e never appears. This criticism could invalidate also the results obtained with isotropic scattering, even though in this case the dim ensionless coupling of the non-linear $m$ odel can be $m$ ade sm all ${ }^{23}$ by assum ing a large anisotropy of the $D$ irac dispersion (i.e. the velocities along and orthogonal to the Ferm isurface). A related ob jection that can be raised is that the non-linear m odel approach to disordered system $s$ is com $m$ only believed to be valid for length scales longer than the $m$ ean free path and energy scales sm aller than the inverse relaxation time $1=.0 n$ the contrary, the solution of the intra-node scattering problem dem onstrates that disorder starts to a ect for instance the density of states at energies of the order of the superconducting gap, hence much bigger than $1=$, nam ely in the regim e when quasiparticle $m$ otion should
be still ballistic.

It is the scope of the present w ork to clear up these inconsistencies of the non-linear m odel approach to disordered d-w ave supercondutors. W e w ill dem onstrate that the above, apparently contradicting, approaches can be actually reconciled. This is ofparticular interest since it provides further support to the standard non-linear m odelapproach based on the replica trick $w$ thin the ferm ionic path-integral form alism, whidh rem ains so far one of the few available tools to dealw ith disorder in generic situations w ith a Ferm isea of interacting quasiparticles. Let us brie $y$ sum $m$ arize our $m$ ain results.

First we are going to present a sim ple and straightforward way to extract the W ZW term. Indeed it is well know n how to derive the W ZW term within eld theories de ned on a continuous space w ith D irac-like dispersing particles. H ow ever in disordered lattioe m odels the existence of such a term is not at all a com m on situation. W ew ill show that the W ZW term em erges quite naturally $w$ ithin the conventional derivation of the non-linear $m$ odel for disordered system $s$ as a consequence of the non-analytical properties of the spectrum $w$ ithin the Brillouin zone. M ore speci cally, the spin-current density in $m$ om entum space, $J_{k}$, in a d-w ave superconductor is a $2 \quad 2 \mathrm{~m}$ atrix in the N am bu spinor space. The W ZW term arises just because the vector product $J_{k} \wedge J_{k}$ is nite and actually gives a m easure of the vorticity around each node. In the presence of purely intra-node im purity scattering we obtain the sam e W ZW action of the non-abelian bosonization from the 1d mapping ${ }^{19,20}$, $w$ ith how ever the inverse $m$ ean free path as a $m$ om entum upper cut-o instead of the inverse lattioe spacing which is usual the $U$ ltra $V$ iolet-regularizer of the $1 d \mathrm{D}$ irac theory. In this context we elucidate the role of the W ZW term in providing the correct scaling behavior of the density of states depending on the im purity-potential range.

A nother issue we clarify is the relationship betw een the coupling constant of the nonlinear m odel and the actual spin-conductance. T he two quantities are know $n$ to coincide at the level of the B om approxim ation. H ow ever, rigorously speaking, the spin-conductance has to be calculated through a K ubo form ula whidh involves advanced and retarded G reen's functions. Since it $m$ akes a di erence $w$ hether quasiparticles are right at the nodal points, w ith zero density of states, or slightly aw ay from them, in which case the density of states is nite, one m ight wander whether the two quantities, spin-oonductance and non-linear m odelcoupling, rem ain equaleven beyond the B om approxim ation, especially in the case of intra-node and inter-opposite-node scattering. W e w ill show that this is actually the case.

F inally we will show that the range of the im purity potential crucially a ects the energy scale at which localization precursore ects starts to appear. In particular we w ill explicitly show that, keeping $x e d$ the inverse relaxation timewithin the Bom approxim ation, $1=0$, and increasing the relative weight of the long-range w ith respect to the short-range com ponents of the disorder, leads to strong reduction below $1=0$ of the energy scale for the on-set of localization. This $m$ ay provide a natural explanation to the partial lack of experm ental evidences of quasiparticle localization in superconducting cuprates.

The paper is organized as follow s. In Section II we introduce the model which we reform ulate $w$ thin the ferm ionic path-integral form alism using the replica trick in Section III. The global sym $m$ etries of the action are discussed in Section IV. In Section $V$ we start the derivation of the non-linear modelwhidh includes two term $s$. The \conventional" one is w orked out in Section V I, and its draw backs discussed in Section V II. T he \unconventional" W ZW term is derived in Section VIII and its consequences for intra-nodal disorder are discussed in Section IX. In Section X we analyse the role of inter-nodal scattering processes and nally Section XI is devoted to the concluding rem arks.

## II. THE M ODEL

The m odelwe study is described by an $H$ artree $F$ ock $H$ am iltonian for $d$-w ave superconductors in the presence of disorder


Here $V(q)$ is the im purity potential, $\underset{k}{\mathrm{y}}=\left(\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{k}}^{\mathrm{y}} ; \mathrm{C} \underset{\mathrm{k} \#}{ }\right)$ the N am bu spinor, $\mathrm{k}=\left(\operatorname{cosk}_{\mathrm{x}} \mathrm{a}\right.$ $\left.\operatorname{cosk}_{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{a}\right)=2$ the superconducting gap $w$ th $d$-w ave sym $m$ etry and $k$ the band-dispersion $m$ easured with respect to the chem ical potential. The Paulim atrioes ${ }_{i}$ 's, $i=1 ; 2 ; 3$, act on the $N$ am bu spinor com ponents. The spectrum of the B ogolubov quasiparticles is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{k}=\frac{q}{\underset{k}{2}+{\underset{k}{2}}_{2}} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

and show sfour nodal points at $\mathrm{k}_{1}=\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{F}}(1 ; 1)={ }^{\mathrm{P}} \overline{2}, \mathrm{k}_{\overline{1}}=\mathrm{k}_{1}, \mathrm{k}_{2}=\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{F}}(1 ; 1) \stackrel{\mathrm{p}}{\mathrm{L}} \overline{2}$ and $k_{\overline{2}}=k_{2}, k_{F}$ being the Ferm im om entum along the diagonals of the $B$ rillouin zone. A round
the nodes it is actually $m$ ore convenient to rotate the axes by 45 degrees through

$$
\begin{equation*}
k=\frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}}\left(k_{x}+k_{y}\right) ; k=\frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}}\left(k_{y} \quad k_{x}\right): \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

In the new reference fram $e, k_{1}=k_{F}(1 ; 0)$ and $k_{2}=k_{F}(0 ; 1)$. In what follow $s$ we de ne

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{k} \quad \mathrm{k} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

the $m$ om entum deviation from any of the four nodal points $k_{a}, a=1 ; \overline{1} ; 2 ; \overline{2}$. For sm all j j $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{F}}$ the spectrum around nodes $1(\overline{1})$ and $2(\overline{2})$ is, respectively,

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{k}_{1}+} & \mathrm{E}_{1}, \mathrm{q} \overline{\mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{F}}^{2}{ }^{2}+\mathrm{v}^{2}{ }^{2}} ; \\
\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{k}_{2}+} & \mathrm{E}_{2}, \mathrm{q} \overline{\mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{F}}^{2}{ }^{2}+\mathrm{v}^{2}{ }^{2}} ; \tag{6}
\end{array}
$$

thus having a conicald irac-like form. Here $v_{F}=j r k_{a} j$ and $v=j r k_{a} j$.
In the presence ofdisorder the $m$ otion of the gapless quasiparticles $m$ ay becom e di usive in the hydrodynam ic regim e. H ow ever di usive propagators appear only in those channels which refer to conserved quantities. Hence, in superconductors, only therm al and spin density uctuationsm ight acquire a di usive behavior. Let us therefore brie y discuss som e properties of the spin current operator which are going to play an im portant role in our analysis.

The $z$-com ponent of the spin-current operator in the N am bu representation satis es
hence, forq! 0 ,

$$
\begin{equation*}
J_{k}(q)!J_{k} r_{k}+r_{k}{ }_{1} \text { : } \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since the $P$ aulim atrioes antioom $m$ ute, the follow ing vector product tums out to be non-zero

$$
\begin{equation*}
J_{k} \wedge J_{k}=2 i_{2} r{ }_{k} \wedge r{ }_{k}: \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

The vector product (9) actually probes the vorticity of the spectrum in $m$ om entum space; nodes \1" and \̄1" have the sam evorticity, $J_{k} \wedge J_{k}!2 i{ }_{2} V_{F} V$, as well as nodes $\backslash 2 "$ and $\backslash \overline{2} "$, although opposite ofnode $\backslash 1 ", J_{k} \wedge J_{k}!\quad 2 i_{2} V_{F} V . W$ e are going to show that this property is crucial to uncover the physical behavior in the presence of disorder.
III. PATH INTEGRALEORMULATION

To analyze the e ect ofdisorder in this $m$ odel, we are going to use a replica trick $m$ ethod w ithin the ferm ionic path-integralapproach. For that we associate to each ferm ionic operator G rassm ann variables through

$$
\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{k}}^{\mathrm{y}}!\overline{\mathrm{a}}_{\mathrm{k}} ; \mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{k}}!\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{k}}:
$$

$N$ otice that, unlike the original ferm ionic operators, $\overline{\mathrm{a}}_{\mathrm{k}}$ and $\mathrm{a}_{k}$ are independent variables. A fter introducing the N am bu spinors
$w$ here $\bar{o}_{k}\left(i!_{n}\right)$ and $q_{k}\left(i!_{n}\right)$ are the $G$ rassm ann variables in $M$ atsubara frequencies, the path-integral action w ithout disorder reads

The disorder introduces the additional term

Since $^{-}{ }_{n k}$ and ${ }_{n k}$ are independent variables, the global transform ation

$$
\begin{equation*}
n k!e^{i}{ }^{2}{ }_{n k} ; \text { - }_{n k}!-_{n k} e^{i}{ }^{2} ; \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

becom es allowed w ithin the path-integral and is indeed a sym $m$ etry transform ation of the fullaction $S=S_{0}+S_{\text {imp }}$ when $!_{n}=0$. A nite frequency, $!_{n} 0$, spoils this sym $m$ etry. If, in addition, the disorder is long range, nam ely it does not induce inter-node scatterings, it is possible to de ne four independent sym m etry transform ations of the above kind, one for each node. This type of chiral sym $m$ etry plays a crucial role for long range disorder, as was rst em phasized in Ref. I9].

W e notice that the disorder does not induce any m ixing between di erent M atsubara frequencies, so that the action decouples into separate pieces, each one referring to a pair of opposite $M$ atsubara frequencies, $!_{n}$, which are coupled together by the superconducting term. For this reason we will just consider one of these pairs, with frequencies which we denote by !, discarding all the others. This is enough to extract inform ation about
the quasiparticle density of states (DOS) at given frequency as well as about transport coe cients.

In order to derive a long-w avelength e ective action, we resort to the replica-tridk technique, hence we rst introduce $N$ replicas of the $G$ rassm an variables, ${ }_{\xi}$ (i!)! $\bar{q}_{k}$ (i!)
 de ne the colum $n$ vectors g and $\overline{\mathrm{c}}_{k}$, w ith 4 N elem ents ( N replicas, 2 spins and 2 frequencies) $C_{a k}$ (i!) and ${ }_{q_{k}}$ (i!), respectively. Finally we introduce new $N$ am bu spinors through ${ }^{3}$
as well as

$$
\text { - }_{k}=t_{k} C^{t} ;
$$

w ith the charge conjugacy operator de ned b, $\frac{3}{Y}$

$$
c=i_{2} \text { : }
$$

Here the Pauli matrioes 1,2 and 3 act on the spin components of the colum $n$ vectors $\mathrm{c}_{k}$ and $\overline{\mathrm{a}}_{\mathrm{k}}$, while ${ }_{1}, 2$ and 3 act on the N am bu com ponents (the diagonal elem ents refer to the particle-hole channels and the o -diagonal ones to the particle-particle channels). For later convenience, we also introduce the Pauli matrioes $s_{1}, s_{2}$ and $s_{3}$, which act on the opposite frequency partners, as well as the identity $m$ atrioes in the spin, $N$ am bu and frequency subspaces, 0,0 and $s_{0}$, respectively.

By m eans of the above de nitions, the clean action can be witten as

Since we are interested in the low-energy long-w avelength behavior, we shall focus our attention only in sm all areas around each of the four nodal points. In the rotated reference frame (3) , the nodes lie at $k_{1}=k_{F}(1 ; 0), k_{\overline{1}}=k_{1}, k_{2}=k_{F}(0 ; 1)$ and $k_{\overline{2}}=k_{2} . U$ sing the de nition (4) for the $s m$ all $m$ om entum deviations aw ay from the nodal points, we introduce new $G$ rassm ann variables de ned around each node through

$$
\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{a} ;} \quad \mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{a}}+; \overline{\mathrm{C}}_{\mathrm{a}} ; \quad \overline{\mathrm{f}}_{\mathrm{a}}+;
$$

$a=1 ; \overline{1} ; 2 ; \overline{2}$, as well as the corresponding $N$ am bu spinors

O ne notioes that for $a=1 ; 2$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& -_{a}=P_{\overline{2}}^{1}\left(\quad \epsilon_{a ;} ; \quad \overline{I_{G}} ; \quad 2\right)=\frac{t}{a} \quad C^{t} ; \\
& \overline{-}_{\bar{a}}=\frac{1}{P_{\overline{2}}}\left(\overline{a_{;}} ; \quad \overline{I_{a}} ; \quad 2\right)=\begin{array}{l}
t \\
a
\end{array} \quad C^{t}:
\end{aligned}
$$

The non-disordered action expanded around the nodes reads

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { i! } \quad \text { i }_{3} \text { i : } \\
& \mathrm{i}=1 ; \bar{i} ; 2 ; \overline{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

W e nd useful to de ne new spinors with com ponents in each of the nodes through

so that

$$
-\quad \frac{t}{1} ; \frac{t}{2} ;{ }_{1}^{t} ;{ }_{2}^{t} \quad c^{t}={ }^{t} C^{t} ;
$$

where the $P$ aulim atrioes 's act on the $\backslash \mathrm{m}$ " and $\backslash \bar{m}$ " subspace, nam ely connect tw o opposite nodes. This naturally leads to a new charge conjugacy de ned through

$$
\begin{equation*}
C=C_{1}=i_{1} 1_{1} \text { : } \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

In what follows we denote as pair 1 the two opposite nodes $\backslash 1 "$ and $\backslash \overline{1} "$, and as pair 2 the other two nodes, $\backslash 2$ " and $\backslash \overline{2} "$. C onsequently we need to introduce also $m$ atrioes in the tw o-pair subspace, 1 and 2, nam ely connecting adjacent nodes, which we w ill denote as o, the identily, 1 , 2 and 3 , the three Paulim atrices.

The clean action reads now

$$
\begin{align*}
& S_{0}={ }^{\mathrm{X}}-{ }_{3} \frac{1}{2}(+\quad)\left[\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{F}}+\mathrm{iv} \quad 2 \mathrm{~S}_{1}\right] \tag{16}
\end{align*}
$$

W e notice that $w$ ithin this path-integral form ulation, the four independent chiral sym $m$ etry transform ations of the form (12) translate into

$$
!\mathrm{T} ;-!-\mathrm{CT}^{\mathrm{t}} \mathrm{C}^{\mathrm{t}} ;
$$

w ith T given by any of the follow ing expressions

$$
\begin{align*}
& T=e^{i} \begin{array}{llll}
s_{1} & 0 & 0 & u
\end{array}  \tag{18}\\
& T=e^{i} 2 \mathrm{~S}_{1} 3^{0} \text {; }  \tag{19}\\
& T=e^{i} \begin{array}{lllll}
2 s_{1} & 0 & 3 & u
\end{array}  \tag{20}\\
& T=e^{i} 2 S_{1} 3^{3} ; \tag{21}
\end{align*}
$$

where is a phase factor and $u$ an arbitrary unit vector.
W e assume that the scattering potential V (q) = V ( q) induced by disorder has independent com ponents which act inside each node, $V(q) \quad U_{0}(q)$, between opposite nodes, $V\left(q+2 k_{1}\right) \quad U_{1}(q)$ and $V\left(q+2 k_{2}\right) \quad U_{2}(q)$, and between adjacent nodes, $\mathrm{V}\left(\mathrm{q}+\mathrm{k}_{1} \quad \mathrm{k}_{2}\right) \quad \mathrm{U}_{12}(\mathrm{q})$ and $\mathrm{V}\left(\mathrm{q}+\mathrm{k}_{1}+\mathrm{k}_{2}\right) \quad \mathrm{U}_{12}(\mathrm{q})$, so that the im purity contribution to the action is

$$
\begin{aligned}
& +X^{\mathrm{iq}} \mathrm{U}_{2}(\mathrm{q})-_{2} \quad \overline{2}+q+\mathrm{U}_{2}(\mathrm{q}) \overline{-}_{\overline{2}+q} \quad 2
\end{aligned}
$$

A part from the rst term in the right hand side of (\&2), we have for convenience kept the node labels. Since the follow ing relations hold:
we can rew rite (22) in the follow ing way:

$$
\begin{align*}
& +\mathrm{X}^{\mathrm{q}} \mathrm{U}_{2}(\mathrm{q}){ }^{-} \quad{ }_{2} \quad \overline{2}+\mathrm{q}+\mathrm{U}_{2}(\mathrm{q}) \overline{\mathrm{L}}^{-q} \quad 2 \\
& +2^{\text {iq }} \mathrm{U}_{12}(\mathrm{q}) \text { - }_{1} \quad 2+\mathrm{q}+\mathrm{U}_{12}(\mathrm{q}) \text { - }_{2+\mathrm{q}} \quad 1 \\
& +2^{\mathrm{X}^{\mathrm{iq}}} \mathrm{U}_{\overline{1} \overline{2}(\mathrm{q})}-_{1} \quad \overline{2}+\mathrm{q}+\mathrm{U}_{1 \overline{2}(q)} \overline{\overline{2}}+\mathrm{q} \quad \mathrm{I}: \tag{23}
\end{align*}
$$

Finally we go back in real space, which now corresponds to the low-energy continuum lim it of the original lattice $m$ odel, and obtain the clean action

$$
\begin{aligned}
& S_{0}=\frac{Z}{Z r}-{ }_{(r)} \frac{1}{2} 3(\text { i@ } \quad \text { i@ })\left[\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{F}}+\mathrm{iv}{ }_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{1}\right] \quad \text { (r) }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { i! } \quad d r^{-}(r) S_{3}(r) \quad d r^{-}(r) \mathbb{H}_{0}(r) \text { i! s] (r); } \tag{24}
\end{align*}
$$

and the im purity term

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { Z } \\
& S_{\text {imp }}=d r U_{0}(r)^{-(r) \quad(r)} \\
& +U_{1}(r){ }_{1}(r) \quad \overline{1}(r)+U_{1}(r){ }_{\overline{1}}(r) \quad 1(r) \\
& +U_{2}(r){ }_{2}(r) \quad \overline{2}(r)+U_{2}(r){ }_{\overline{2}}(r) \quad 2(r) \\
& +2 \mathrm{U}_{12}(\mathrm{r}){ }_{1}(\mathrm{r}) \quad 2(\mathrm{r})+2 \mathrm{U}_{12}(\mathrm{r}){ }_{2}(\mathrm{r}) \quad 1(\mathrm{r}) \\
& +2 \mathrm{U}_{1 \overline{2}}(\mathrm{r}){ }^{-}{ }_{1}(r) \quad \overline{2}(r)+2 \mathrm{U}_{1 \overline{2}}(r){ }_{\overline{2}}(r) \quad{ }_{1}(r): \tag{25}
\end{align*}
$$

| P aulim atrioes | subspace of action |
| :---: | :---: |
| $0 \boldsymbol{i} 1 \boldsymbol{i} 2 \boldsymbol{i} 3$ | spin com ponents |
| $0 \boldsymbol{i} 1 \boldsymbol{i} 2 \boldsymbol{i} 3$ | N am bu com ponents |
| $s_{0} \boldsymbol{i} s_{1} \boldsymbol{i} s_{2} \boldsymbol{i} s_{3}$ | opposite frequency partners |
| $0 \boldsymbol{i} 1 \boldsymbol{i} 2 \boldsymbol{i} 3$ | opposite nodal points |
| $0 \boldsymbol{i} 1 \boldsymbol{i} 2 \boldsymbol{i} 3$ | the tw o pairs of opposite nodes |

TABLE I: The various tw o-com ponents subspaces in which each set of $P$ aulim atrices act

W e further assum e that the disorder is -like correlated w ith

$$
\begin{align*}
& h U_{0}(r) i=0 ; h U_{0}(r) U_{0}\left(r^{0}\right) i=u^{2} \quad(r \quad l) ; \\
& h U_{1}(r) i=0 ; h U_{1}(r) U_{1}\left(r^{0}\right) i=2 v^{2} \quad(r r r) ; \\
& h U_{2}(x) i=0 ; h U_{2}(x) U_{2}\left(r^{0}\right) i=2 v^{2} \quad\left(\begin{array}{ll}
r & \text { r) ; }
\end{array}\right.  \tag{26}\\
& h U_{12}(r) i=0 ; h U_{12}(r) U_{12}\left(r^{0}\right) i=2 w^{2} \quad\left(\begin{array}{ll}
r & \text { r) ; }
\end{array}\right. \\
& h U_{1 \overline{2}}(r) i=0 ; h U_{1 \overline{2}}(r) U_{1 \overline{2}}\left(r^{0}\right) i=2 w^{2} \quad\left(\begin{array}{ll}
r & I
\end{array}\right):
\end{align*}
$$

W e conclude by noticing that (i) if only u 0 all transform ations (18) \{ (21) leave the action invariant; (ii) ifu $\in 0$ and $v \in 0$ only (18) and (20) are allowed; (iii) nally ifu $\} 0$, $\mathrm{v} \in 0$ and $\mathrm{w} \in 0$ only (18) rem ains.
IV. SYMMETRY PROPERTIES

Since we have been obliged to introduce so many Paulim atrices, including the identity denoted as the zeroth P aulim atrix, for sake of clarity we prefer to start this Section by rst sum $m$ arizing in $T a b l e$ the subspaces in $w$ hich any of them act.

N ow, let us uncover all global sym m etry transform ations. W e start assum ing that only intra-node disorder is present, nam ely $\mathrm{U}_{0} \in 0$ but $\mathrm{U}_{1}=\mathrm{U}_{2}=\mathrm{U}_{12}=\mathrm{U}_{1 \overline{2}}=0$.

If the frequency is zero, the action $S_{0}+S_{i m p}$ is invariant under unitary global transfor-
$m$ ations $T$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{C}^{\mathrm{t}} \mathrm{~T}^{\mathrm{t}} \mathrm{C} 3 \mathrm{~T} & =3 ; \\
\mathrm{C}^{\mathrm{t}} \mathrm{~T}^{\mathrm{t}} \mathrm{C} 32 \mathrm{~S}_{1} \mathrm{~T} & =32 \mathrm{~S}_{1} ; \\
\mathrm{C}^{\mathrm{t}} \mathrm{~T}^{\mathrm{t}} \mathrm{C} 33 \mathrm{~T} & =33 ; \\
\mathrm{C}^{\mathrm{t}} \mathrm{~T}^{\mathrm{t}} \mathrm{C} 332 \mathrm{~S}_{1} \mathrm{~T} & =332 \mathrm{~S}_{1} ; \\
\mathrm{C}^{\mathrm{t}} \mathrm{~T}^{\mathrm{t}} \mathrm{CT} & =\mathbf{1}:
\end{aligned}
$$

They im ply that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{C}^{\mathrm{t}} \mathrm{~T}^{\mathrm{t}} \mathrm{C}=\mathrm{T}^{1} \tag{27}
\end{equation*}
$$

as well as that

$$
\begin{equation*}
[T ; 3]=0 ; \quad[T ; 3]=0 ; \quad\left[T ; 2 S_{1}\right]=0: \tag{28}
\end{equation*}
$$

W e param etrize $T$ as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{T}=\frac{1}{2}\left(\mathrm{~T}_{1}+\mathrm{T}_{2}\right) \quad 0+\frac{1}{2}\left(\mathrm{~T}_{1} \quad \mathrm{~T}_{2}\right) \tag{29}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the su $x \backslash 1 "$ refers to the pair 1 (opposite nodes 1 and $\overline{1}$ ) and $\backslash 2$ " to the pair 2 (opposite nodes 2 and $\overline{2}$ ). The sym $m$ etry m odes for pair 1 and 2 can be param etrized by the $16 \mathrm{~N} \quad 16 \mathrm{~N}$ unitary operators

$$
\mathrm{T}_{1(2)}=\frac{1}{2}\left(0+{ }_{3}\right) \mathrm{V}_{1(2)}+\frac{1}{2}\left(0 \quad 3_{3}\right) \mathrm{V}_{\overline{1}(\overline{2})} \quad \begin{gathered}
0 \\
\mathrm{~V}_{1(2)}
\end{gathered} \begin{gathered}
1 \\
0 \\
\mathrm{~V}_{\overline{1}(\overline{2})}
\end{gathered}
$$

where the $V$ 's are $8 \mathrm{~N} \quad 8 \mathrm{~N}$ unitary m atrices. Because of (27) we get

$$
\mathrm{C}^{\mathrm{t}} \mathrm{~T}_{1(2)}^{\mathrm{t}} \mathrm{C}=\mathrm{T}_{1(2)}^{1}=\mathrm{T}_{1(2)}^{\mathrm{Y}}
$$

and $V_{1_{(2)}}$ and $V_{\overline{1}(\overline{2})}$ are actually not independent as

$$
\begin{equation*}
c^{t} V_{1(2)}^{t} c=V_{\overline{1}(\overline{2})}^{y}: \tag{30}
\end{equation*}
$$

T herefore

$$
\mathrm{T}_{1(2)}=\begin{array}{cccc}
0 & & & \\
\begin{array}{c}
\mathrm{V}_{1(2)} \\
\\
0
\end{array} & c^{t} & 0 & \\
\mathrm{~V}_{1(2)}^{\mathrm{y}} & \mathrm{t} & \mathrm{C}
\end{array}
$$

is indeed param etrized by a single $8 \mathrm{~N} \quad 8 \mathrm{~N}$ unitary m atrix $\mathrm{V}_{1}(2)$. Since the two pairs of nodes behave sim ilarly, in what follow s we drop the su as 1 and 2. A coording to (28) we still need to im pose that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left[V ;{ }_{2} S_{1}\right]=0: \tag{31}
\end{equation*}
$$

To this purpose let us introduce the follow ing unitary operation

$$
U=\frac{1}{2}(0+2) \frac{1}{2}\left(\begin{array}{ll}
0 & 2 \tag{32}
\end{array}\right) S_{3} e^{i_{4} s_{2}}:
$$

which transform s

$$
!U ; \quad!\quad{ }^{t} U^{t} C^{t}={ }^{t} C^{t} U^{Y}=-U^{y} \text {; }
$$

so that for any operator $O$

$$
\text { -O ! } \quad \mathrm{U}^{\mathrm{Y}} \mathrm{O} U \quad \text { : }
$$

O ne readily show sthat

$$
\begin{equation*}
U^{Y}{ }_{2} S_{1} U=S_{3} ; U^{Y} S_{3} U=S ; \tag{33}
\end{equation*}
$$

hence (31) transform s into

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left[V ; s_{3}\right]=0 ; \tag{34}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is ful led by the general expression

$$
V=\frac{1}{2}(A+B) s_{0}+\frac{1}{2}\left(\begin{array}{ll}
A & B \tag{35}
\end{array}\right) s_{i} ;
$$

$w$ ith $A$ and $B$ being independent $4 N \quad 4 N$ unitary $m$ atriges. Therefore the original sym $m$ etry tums out to be $U(4 N) U(4 N)$ for pair 1, and analogously for pair 2, in total $\mathrm{U}(4 \mathrm{~N}) \quad \mathrm{U}(4 \mathrm{~N}) \quad \mathrm{U}(4 \mathrm{~N}) \quad \mathrm{U}(4 \mathrm{~N})$.

W e notice that, in the presence of a nite frequency, ! 0, we shall further im pose through (33) that

$$
\left[V ; s_{1}\right]=0 ;
$$

which is satis ed by

$$
V=C s_{0} ;
$$

$w$ ith $C$ belonging to $U(4 N)$. Therefore the sym $m$ etry is low ered by the frequency down to $\mathrm{U}(4 \mathrm{~N})$ for the pair 1 tim es $\mathrm{U}(4 \mathrm{~N})$ for the pair 2.

W thin the non-linear m odelapproach to disordered system s , the frequency plays actually the role of a sym $m$ etry-breaking eld. This leads to the identi cation of the transverse $m$ odes $V$ ? as those satisfying

$$
\mathrm{s}_{1} \mathrm{~V}^{?} \mathrm{~s}_{1}=\mathrm{V}^{?}{ }^{1}=\mathrm{V}^{? \mathrm{y}} ;
$$

im plying $A=B^{y}$ in Eq.(35) so that we can write
where $G$ belongs to $U(4 N)$. In other words the coset space spanned by the transverse $m$ odes is stilla group, nam ely $U(4 N)$. It is convenient to factorize out ofg the abelian com ponent. For that we w rite

$$
\begin{equation*}
G=e^{i^{p}} \overline{\bar{N}} g ; \tag{37}
\end{equation*}
$$

where is a scalar and $g$ belongs to $S U(4 N)$. The form $s$ (36) and (37) $w$ ill be useful in the follow ing to express the non-linear model directly in term $s$ of $g$ and. A fter the transform ation (32) from Eq.(30) we nd that
which leads to

Let us conclude by show ing what would change form ore general disorder potential. First let us consider the case in which the disorder also contains term $s$ which couple opposite nodes, i.e. $U_{1} \in 0$ and $U_{2} \in 0$. In this case the ${ }_{3}-\mathrm{m}$ odes are not anym ore allowed by sym $m$ etry, so we have to im pose that $V_{1_{(2)}}=V_{\overline{1}(\overline{2})}$, nam ely, through (39), that $1_{1(2)}=0$ and

$$
g_{1(2)}^{\mathrm{y}}=g_{1(2)}^{1}=\begin{array}{llll}
1 & 2 g_{1(2)}^{t} & 2 & 1 \tag{40}
\end{array}:
$$

The coset becom es now the group $\mathrm{Sp}(2 \mathrm{~N}$ ) of unitary-sym plectic $m$ atrioes (also called U Sp (4N )) for pair 1 and analogously for pair 2, i.e. Sp (2N ) Sp (2N ).

Finally, if also scattering between adjacent nodes is allow ed, $U_{12} \in 0$ and $U_{1 \overline{2}} \in 0$, then also the ${ }_{3} \mathrm{~m}$ odes do not leave the action invariant. In this case we have to im pose that $\mathrm{V}_{1}^{?}=\mathrm{V}_{2}{ }^{?}$, so that the coset space is the group $\operatorname{Sp}(2 \mathrm{~N})$.
V. THENON-LINEAR -MODEL

In what follow s we begin analyzing just the case in which the disorder only induces intranode scattering processes. At the end we w ill retum back to the m ost general case. W thin
the replica tridk, we can average the action over the disorder probabillty distribution, after which (25) w ith $v=w=0$ [see Eq. (26)] transform $s$ into

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{i m p}={\frac{u^{2}}{2}}^{Z} d r-(r) \quad(r)^{2}: \tag{41}
\end{equation*}
$$

We de ne 32N 32N m atrioes $X$ ( $r$ ) by

$$
X(x) \quad(r) \quad(r) ;
$$

so that (41) can be also w ritten as

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{i m p}={\frac{u^{2}}{2}}^{Z} d r \operatorname{Tr}(X(r) X(r)): \tag{42}
\end{equation*}
$$

By m eans of an H ubbard-Stratonovidh transform ation one can show that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\exp \quad \frac{u^{2}}{2} d r \operatorname{Tr}(X(r) X(r))=D Q(r) \exp \quad d r \frac{1}{2 u^{2}} \operatorname{Tr} Q(r)^{2} \quad i T r Q(r) X(r)\right] \text {; } \tag{43}
\end{equation*}
$$

$w$ th $Q(r)$ being herm itian $32 N \quad 32 N$ auxiliary m atrix elds.
In conclusion the full action, (24) plus (43), becom es

$$
\begin{align*}
S= & \frac{1}{2 u_{Z}^{2}}{ }^{Z} d r \operatorname{Tr} Q(r)^{2} \\
& \left.+\quad d r-(r) \mathbb{H}_{0}(r) \quad \text { iQ }(r) \quad i!\varsubsetneqq\right] \quad(r): \tag{44}
\end{align*}
$$

O ne obtains the e ective action which describes the auxiliary eld $Q(r)$ by integrating out the $G$ rassm ann variables, thus getting

$$
\begin{equation*}
S[Q]={\frac{1}{2 u^{2}}}^{Z} d r \operatorname{Tr} Q(r)^{2} \quad \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Tr} \ln \left[i Q+i!S_{3} \quad H_{0}\right]: \tag{45}
\end{equation*}
$$

W e further proceed in the derivation of a long-w avelength e ective action for $Q$ (r) by follow ing the conventional approach. F irst of all we calculate the saddle point expression of $Q(r)$, which we denote by $Q_{0} S_{3}$, assum ing it is unform, in the presence of an in nitesim al sym $m$ etry breaking term ! $s_{3}$. Then we neglect longitudinal uctuations and param etrize the actuale (r) by

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q(r)^{\prime} T(r)^{1} Q_{0} S_{3} T(r)=\frac{1}{2}(0+3) Q_{1}(r)+\frac{1}{2}(0 \quad 3) Q_{2}(r) ; \tag{46}
\end{equation*}
$$

where through (29) $Q_{a b}(r)=a b Q_{a}(r) w$ ith

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q_{a}(r)=T_{a}(r)^{1} Q_{0} S_{3} T_{a}(r)=Q_{0} S_{3} T_{a}(r)^{2}=T_{a}(r)^{2} Q_{0} S_{3} ; \tag{47}
\end{equation*}
$$

being the auxiliary eld in the pair subspace $a ; b=1 ; 2$. N otioe that, even though the $m$ ost generalQ (r) would couple the nodes together, nam ely would include o -diagonalelem ents $Q_{12}(r),(46)$ does not contain any $m$ ixing term. This sim ply re ects that the o -diagonal com ponents are not di usive, hence m assive.

In order to derive the long-w avelength action we nd it convenient to decom pose the action into the real part

$$
\begin{array}{rlll}
S_{\text {NL M }}= & {\frac{1}{2 u^{2}}}^{\mathrm{Z}} \operatorname{dr} \operatorname{Tr} Q(r)^{2} \\
& \frac{1}{4} \operatorname{Tr} \ln \left[i Q+i!S_{3}\right. & \left.H_{0}\right] & \frac{1}{4} \operatorname{Tr} \ln \quad \text { iQ } \quad i!s \tag{48}
\end{array} H_{0}^{Y} ;
$$

which, as we shall see, gives the conventional non-linear model, and the im aginary part

$$
\begin{equation*}
S=\frac{1}{4} \operatorname{Tr} \ln \left[i Q+i!S_{3} \quad H_{0}\right]+\frac{1}{4} \operatorname{Tr} \ln ^{h} \quad \text { iQ } \quad i!s \quad H_{0}^{\mathrm{Y}} \text {; } \tag{49}
\end{equation*}
$$

which we will show gives rise to a $W$ ZW term.
VI. CONVENTIONAL -MODEL

By m eans of (46), the real part of the action, (48), can be w ritten as

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{\mathrm{NL} \mathrm{M}}=\frac{\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{e}}}{2 \mathrm{u}^{2}} 32 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{Q}_{0}^{2} \quad \frac{1}{4} \operatorname{Tr} \ln \mathrm{G}^{1} ; \tag{50}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $V_{\text {eff }}$ is the e ective volum e corresponding to the long-wavelength theory (roughly speaking $V_{\text {eff }}=V=4$, since we have im plicitly folded the $B$ rillouin zone into a single quadrant, in order to m ake all nodes coincide), and

$$
\begin{gather*}
\mathrm{G}^{1}=\mathrm{H}_{0} \mathrm{H}_{0}^{\mathrm{Y}}+\mathrm{Q}_{0}^{2}+!^{2}+!\left(\mathrm{Q} \mathrm{~s}_{3}+\mathrm{s}_{3} \mathrm{Q}\right)+\mathrm{iH} \mathrm{H}_{0} \mathrm{Q} \text { iQ } \mathrm{H}_{0}^{\mathrm{Y}} \\
\mathrm{G}^{1} \quad ; \tag{51}
\end{gather*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{G}_{0}^{1} & =\mathrm{H}_{0} \mathrm{H}_{0}^{\mathrm{Y}}+\mathrm{Q}_{0}^{2}+!^{2} ; \\
& =!\mathrm{fQ} ; \boldsymbol{s g} \quad \mathrm{H}_{0} \mathrm{Q}+\mathrm{iQ} \mathrm{H}_{0}^{\mathrm{y}}:
\end{aligned}
$$

$W$ e notice that $S_{3} H_{0} S_{3}=H{ }_{0}^{Y}$; therefore

$$
i H_{0} Q \quad i Q H_{0}^{Y}=i H_{0} Q s_{3} S_{3} \quad \text { iQ } s_{0} H_{0} S_{3}=i\left[H_{0} ; Q S_{3}\right] s_{3}=J \quad r Q \text {; }
$$

where we m ade use of the equivalence $Q s_{3} \quad T^{2}$ and of the expression of the spin current operator in the long wave-length lim it

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.J(r)=i \mathbb{H}_{0}(r) ; r\right]: \tag{52}
\end{equation*}
$$

A nalogously one can show that

$$
i H \circ Q \quad i Q H_{0}^{y}=i s_{3} H{ }_{0}^{y} S_{3} Q \quad \text { is } s_{3} Q H{ }_{0}^{y}=\quad i s S_{3} Q ; H{ }_{0}^{i}=r Q \quad \text { Y; }
$$

so that the self-energy operator can be w rilten as

$$
\begin{equation*}
=!f Q ; s g \quad J \quad r Q=!f Q_{3} g s \quad r Q \quad Y_{\mathcal{I}} \tag{53}
\end{equation*}
$$

W e then expand the action up to second order in and obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
& S_{N L M}=\frac{V_{e}}{2 u^{2}} 32 \mathrm{~N}_{\mathrm{N}}{ }_{0}^{2} \quad \frac{1}{4} \operatorname{Tr} \ln G^{1} \\
& =\frac{\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{e}}}{2 \mathrm{u}^{2}} 32 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{Q}_{0}^{2}+\frac{1}{4} \operatorname{Tr} \ln \left[G_{0}\right] \quad \frac{1}{4} \operatorname{Tr} \ln \left[\begin{array}{lll}
1 & G & ]
\end{array}\right. \\
& =\frac{\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{e}}}{2 \mathrm{u}^{2}} 32 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{Q}_{0}^{2}+\frac{1}{4} \operatorname{Tr} \ln \left[\mathrm{G}_{0}\right]+\frac{1}{4} \operatorname{Tr}\left[\mathrm{G}_{0} \quad\right]+\frac{1}{8} \operatorname{Tr}\left[\begin{array}{lll}
G_{0} & \mathrm{G}_{0} & ]
\end{array}\right. \\
& \left.=\frac{\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{e}}}{2 \mathrm{u}^{2}} 32 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{Q}_{0}^{2}+\frac{1}{4} \operatorname{Tr} \ln \left[\mathrm{G}_{0}\right] \quad \frac{!}{2} \operatorname{Tr} Q \mathrm{~s}_{3} \mathrm{G}_{0}\right] \\
& +\frac{!^{2}}{8} \operatorname{Tr}\left[G_{0} f Q ; S_{3} g G_{0} f Q ; S_{3} g\right]+\frac{1}{8} \operatorname{Tr} G_{0} \tilde{r} Q \quad Y_{J} G_{0} J \quad \tilde{r} Q^{i}: \tag{54}
\end{align*}
$$

N otioe that we have arrived to $S_{\text {N L }}$ m in term sof $\tilde{r} Q$ without passing through a gauge transform ation to carry out the gradient expansion so avoiding any problem related to a proper treatm ent of the Jacobian determ inant $t^{20}$.
A. Saddle point equation

In $m$ om entum space one nds that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{H}_{0} \mathrm{H}_{0}^{\mathrm{y}} & =\frac{1}{2}{ }^{2}+2 \mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{F}}^{2}+\mathrm{v}^{2}+{ }_{3} \frac{1}{2} 2^{2} \mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{F}}^{2} \mathrm{v}^{2} \\
& =\frac{1}{2} \mathrm{E}_{1}^{2}+\mathrm{E}_{2}^{2}+{ }_{3} \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{E}_{1}^{2} \mathrm{E}_{2}^{2} ;
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\mathrm{E}_{1}$ is the spectrum of quasiparticles around nodes $\backslash 1$ " and $\backslash \overline{1} "$, and analogously for $\mathrm{E}_{2}$, see (5) and (6). Therefore

$$
\mathrm{G}_{0}=\frac{1}{2}\left[\mathrm{G}_{1}+\mathrm{G}_{2}\right]+{ }_{3} \frac{1}{2}\left[\mathrm{G}_{1} \quad \mathrm{G}_{2}\right] ;
$$

where

$$
\mathrm{G}_{1}=\frac{1}{\mathrm{E}_{1}^{2}+\mathrm{Q}_{0}^{2}+!^{2}} ; \quad \mathrm{G}_{2}=\frac{1}{\mathrm{E}_{2}^{2}+\mathrm{Q}_{0}^{2}+!^{2}} ;
$$

so that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{G}_{0}^{2}=\frac{1}{2} \mathrm{G}_{1}^{2}+\mathrm{G}_{2}^{2}+{ }_{3} \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{G}_{1}^{2} \quad \mathrm{G}_{2}^{2} \tag{55}
\end{equation*}
$$

The saddle-point equation is obtained by taking $Q(r)=Q_{0}$ and $m$ inim izing the action, which leads to the self-consistency equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{Q_{0}}{Q_{0}+!}=u^{2} \frac{1}{V}{ }_{k}^{X} \frac{1}{E_{k}^{2}+\left(Q_{0}+!\right)^{2}} \tag{56}
\end{equation*}
$$

originally derived in $R$ ef. [1]. The solution of this equation, in the lim it ! ! 0 , reads

$$
Q_{0}=\quad \exp \frac{V_{\mathrm{F}} \mathrm{~V}}{2 \mathrm{u}^{2}} ;
$$

where is an ultraviolet cut-o which is roughly the energy scale above which the spectrum deviates appreciably from a linear one, in other words , .W e notioe that in the generic case w ith nite inter-nodal scattering, nam ely with non zero $v^{2}$ and $w^{2}$, the saddle point equation rem ains the sam e apart form $u^{2}!u^{2}+2 w^{2}+v^{2}$.

The quasiparticle density of states $N()$, after the analytic continuation of i! to the positive realaxis, i! ! > 0, tums out to be, for sm all ,

$$
\begin{align*}
& 2 \text { 3 } \\
& N()=\frac{2}{{ }^{2} V_{F} V}{ }^{4} Q_{0} \ln q \frac{}{{ }^{2}+Q_{0}^{2}}+\frac{\overline{2}}{2} \quad \tan ^{1} \frac{Q_{0}^{2}{ }^{2}}{2 Q_{0}} \quad 5: \tag{57}
\end{align*}
$$

Therefore the density of states at the saddle-point acquires a nite value $N_{0} \quad Q_{0}=u^{2}$ at the chem ical potential $=0$, while, for $\quad$ Qo, tums back to the linear dependence N ( ) as in the absence of disorder.
B. Frequency dependent term s

The rst order term in the frequency is just

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\frac{!}{2} \operatorname{Tr}\left[s_{3} G_{0}\right]=\quad!-\frac{N_{0}}{2} Q^{Z} \operatorname{dr} \operatorname{Tr} Q(r) s_{3}\right]: \tag{58}
\end{equation*}
$$

The second order term is readily found to be

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{!^{2}}{8} \operatorname{Tr}\left[G_{0} f Q ; S_{3} g G_{0} f Q ; S_{3} g\right]=\frac{1}{32^{2}} \frac{!^{2}}{v_{F} v} \frac{1}{Q_{0}^{2}} \quad \mathrm{dr} \operatorname{Tr} f Q(r) ; s_{3} g^{2}: \tag{59}
\end{equation*}
$$

$T$ his term is negligible as com pared to (58) for frequencies ! much smaller than $V_{F} v^{\prime} N_{0}$. The latter is therefore the energy scale below which di usion sets in at the m ean eld level, nam ely the so-called inverse relaxation tim e in the Bom approxim ation, $1=0$.
C. G radient expansion

The Fourier transform of the current operator is

$$
\begin{equation*}
J(q)=3 \frac{1}{2}\left[J_{1}(q)+J_{2}(q)\right]+33 \frac{1}{2}\left[J_{1}(q) \quad J_{2}(q)\right] ; \tag{60}
\end{equation*}
$$

where, at long wavelengths q ! 0,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& J_{1}(\mathrm{q})!\mathrm{J}_{1}=\left(\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{F}} ; \text { iv } 2 \mathrm{~S}_{1}\right) \\
& \mathrm{J}_{2}(\mathrm{q})!\mathrm{J}_{2}=\left(\mathrm{iv} \quad 2 \mathrm{~S}_{1} ; \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{F}}\right):
\end{aligned}
$$

It is then easy to derive the follow ing expression of the tensor product $\mathrm{J} \mathrm{J}^{\mathrm{y}}$

To evaluate the second order gradient correction in (54) we notioe that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =\frac{1}{16}_{i ; j}^{\mathrm{X}} \operatorname{Tr}^{\mathrm{h}} \varrho_{i} Q @_{j} Q \quad G_{0} J_{j}^{Y} G_{0} J_{i}+G_{0} J_{i}^{Y} G_{0} J_{j}
\end{aligned}
$$

In the long wavelength lim it

$$
\begin{aligned}
& G_{0} J_{j}^{y} G_{0} J_{i}+G_{0} J_{i}^{y} G_{0} J_{j}=\frac{1}{V}^{X} \quad G_{0} \quad J_{j}^{y} G_{0} \quad J_{i}+G_{0} \quad J_{i}^{y} G_{0} \quad J_{j} \\
& ={ }_{i j} \frac{1}{4 V}^{X} \quad G_{1}^{2}+G_{2}^{2} \quad V_{F}^{2}+V^{2}+3 V_{F}^{2} \quad V^{2} \quad(i \quad i) ;
\end{aligned}
$$

since ${ }^{P} \quad G_{1}^{2} \quad G_{2}^{2}=0 . W e \quad n d t h a t$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{4 \mathrm{~V}} \mathrm{X} \mathrm{G}_{1}^{2}+\mathrm{G}_{2}^{2}=\frac{1}{2 V}^{\mathrm{X}} \mathrm{G}_{1}^{2} \\
& =\frac{1}{2}^{\mathrm{Z}} \frac{\mathrm{~d} \mathrm{~d}}{4{ }^{2}} \frac{1}{\mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{F}}^{2}{ }^{2}+\mathrm{V}^{2}{ }^{2}+\mathrm{Q}_{0}^{2}} \\
& =\frac{1}{8 \mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{F}} \mathrm{~V}}{ }_{0}^{1} \mathrm{dx}^{2}{\frac{1}{\mathrm{x}^{2}+\mathrm{Q}_{0}^{2}}}^{2}=\frac{1}{8 \mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{F}} \mathrm{~V}} \frac{1}{\mathrm{Q}_{0}^{2}}:
\end{aligned}
$$

The D rude spin-conductivity is de ned $b_{\frac{1}{Y}}^{1}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
=\frac{1}{4^{2}} \frac{\mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{F}}^{2}+\mathrm{v}^{2}}{\mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{F}} \mathrm{~V}} ; \tag{62}
\end{equation*}
$$

so that the second order gradient correction can be w rilten as

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left.\left.\frac{Z}{16 Q_{0}^{2}} \quad \operatorname{drTr} \operatorname{Tr} Q(r) \quad r Q(r)\right]+\frac{v_{F}^{2}}{v_{F}^{2}+v^{2}} \operatorname{Trf}_{3} \llbracket Q(r) @ Q(r) \quad @ Q(r) @ Q(r)\right] g: \\
& \text { D. The nal form of } S_{N L M}
\end{aligned}
$$

Collecting all contributions which are second order in the gradient expansion and rst order in the frequency we eventually obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { Z } \\
& S_{\mathrm{NL} \mathrm{M}}=\overline{16 Q_{0}^{2}} \quad \mathrm{dr} \operatorname{Tr}[\mathrm{r} Q(\mathrm{r}) \quad \mathrm{r} Q(\mathrm{r})] \\
& \left.+\frac{}{16 Q_{0}^{2}} \quad \mathrm{dr} \frac{\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{F}}^{2} \mathrm{v}^{2}}{v_{F}^{2}+\mathrm{v}^{2}} \operatorname{Trf} 3 @ Q(r) @ Q(r) \quad @ Q(r) @ Q(r)\right] g \\
& \left.!\frac{N_{0}}{2_{Z} Q_{0}} d r \operatorname{Tr} Q(r) S_{3}\right] \\
& =X_{i=1 ; 2}^{X} \quad d r \frac{1}{16 Q_{0}^{2}} \operatorname{Tr} @ Q_{i}(r) \quad{ }^{\text {(i) } \left.@ Q_{i}(r) \quad!\frac{N_{0}}{2 Q_{0}} \operatorname{Tr} Q_{i}(r) S_{3}\right]: ~} \tag{63}
\end{align*}
$$

Here we have de ned a m etric tensor for the pair 1 which includes nodes $\backslash 1 "$ and $\overline{\ 1}$ ",

$$
{ }^{(1)}=\frac{2}{V_{F}^{2}+v^{2}}{ }^{0} \begin{gathered}
1 \\
\mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{F}}^{2} \\
0
\end{gathered} \mathrm{~V}^{2} \mathrm{~A} \text {; }
$$

and for the pair 2, i.e. for nodes $\backslash 2 "$ and $\backslash \overline{2} "$,

$$
{ }^{(2)}=\frac{2}{V_{F}^{2}+v^{2}}{ }^{0} \begin{gathered}
1 \\
\mathrm{~V}^{2}
\end{gathered} 0_{\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{F}}^{2}}^{\mathrm{A}}:
$$

In reality the above action is not the $m$ ost general one allowed by sym $m$ etry. A s we discussed earlier, the theory possesses tw o chiral abelian sectors, which actually occur in the singlet channels $32 S_{1} 0$ and $32_{2} S_{1}$, see (19) and (21). In analogy w ith Ref. [24], we expect that upon integrating out longitudinal uctuations the follow ing term would appear:

$$
S_{\text {N L M }}=\frac{X}{16^{2} Q_{0}^{4}} \quad \begin{align*}
& i=1 ; 2
\end{align*} \quad \operatorname{dr} \operatorname{Tr}\left[\begin{array}{lll}
3 & 2 & \left.S_{1} Q_{i}(r) @ Q_{i}(r)\right] \quad{ }^{\text {(i) }} \operatorname{Tr}[3 \\
2 & \left.S_{1} Q_{i}(r) @ Q_{i}(r)\right] ;
\end{array}\right.
$$

with / $u^{2}$.
In conclusion the $m$ ost general non-linear $m$ odel is given by

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left.S_{N L M}=X_{i=1 ; 2}^{Z} d r \frac{1}{16 Q_{0}^{2}} \operatorname{Tr} @ Q_{i}(r) \quad{ }^{\text {(i) }} @ Q_{i}(r) \quad!\frac{N_{0}}{2 Q_{0}} \operatorname{Tr} Q_{i}(r) S_{3}\right] \\
& +\frac{}{16^{2} Q_{0}^{4}} \quad \operatorname{Tr}\left[{ }_{3} \quad 2 S_{1} Q_{i}(r) @ Q_{i}(r)\right] \quad{ }^{(i)} \operatorname{Tr}\left[\begin{array}{lll}
3 & 2 & \left.S_{1} Q_{i}(r) @ Q_{i}(r)\right]: ~
\end{array}\right. \tag{65}
\end{align*}
$$

VII. FA ILURE OF THECONVENTIONAL -M ODEL

The non-linear m odel (65) belongs to one of the known chiral models encountered when two-sublattioe sym $m$ etry holds, see Refs. [g ,24,25]. Ifwe sim ply borrow known results, see e.g. Table I in Ref. [9], we should expect that the -function of the conductivity vanishes in the zero replica lim it, N ! 0 . That w ould im ply absence of localization and persistence of di usive m odes. M oreover we should predict a quasiparticle density of states N ( ) which diverges like ${ }^{26,27,28}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
N()^{\prime} \frac{1}{-} \exp A^{3}{\underline{\ln } \underline{B}^{\#}}^{\#} ; \tag{66}
\end{equation*}
$$

w ith A and B some positive constants. This is clearly suspicious since in the absence of disorder the density of states actually vanishes, N ( ) .

O ne is tem pted to correlate the above suspicious result with what is found for the ele$m$ entary loops of the $W$ ilson-P olyakov renorm alization group approach. H ere one integrates out iteratively degrees of freedom in a $m$ om entum shell from the highest cut-o to $=s$, $w$ ith $s>0$ eventually sent to in nity. In our case these fundam ental loops for either nodes are given by

$$
\underline{1}_{=s<j j}^{Z} \frac{d}{4^{2}} \frac{1}{(1 ; 2)}=\ln s \quad g \ln s ;
$$

and provide the de nition of the dim ensionless coupling constant $g$, which should necessarily be sm allto justify a loop-expansion in $\mathrm{g} \ln \mathrm{s} \quad 1$. In our case it tums out that $g=1, \mathrm{~m}$ aking any loop expansion $m$ eaningless.
$T$ his results is at odds w ith the standard non linear models for disordered system $s$ where $\mathrm{g} \quad 1=1$ for weak disorder. Here, whatever weak is the disorder, yet $\mathrm{g}=1$. This peculiar fact was originally discussed in Ref. [19], where the authors identi ed correctly the com plete failure of the non-crossing approxim ation as a starting point of perturbation theory due to the absence of sm all control param eters. This m ight lead to the conclusion that the non-linear m odel we have so far derived is useless in this problem, since it heavily relies upon the assum ption that quantum uctuations around the saddle-point solution can be controlled perturbatively.

In the follow ing Section we are going to show that the above conclusion is not correct and that one only needs to be $m$ ore careful in deriving the proper non-linear modelaction.
VIII. W ESS-ZUM INO-NOVIKOV-W IT TEN TERM

Indeed we have not yet accom plished all our plan, as we still need to evaluate the im aginary part of the action (49). At leading order we can drop the frequency dependence of (49), hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
S=\frac{1}{4} \operatorname{Tr} \ln \left[\text { iQ } \quad H_{0}\right]+\frac{1}{4} \operatorname{Tr} \ln ^{h} \text { iQ } H^{i}: \tag{67}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is $m$ ore convenient to evaluate the variation of $S$ along a $m$ assless path de ned through

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q(r) Q(r)+Q(r) Q(r)=0: \tag{68}
\end{equation*}
$$

We nd that

$$
S=\frac{i}{4} \operatorname{Tr}\left[\begin{array}{l}
G \tag{69}
\end{array}\right]+\frac{i}{4} \operatorname{Tr} G^{Y} Q ;
$$

where

$$
\mathrm{G}=\left(\begin{array}{ll}
\text { (iQ } & \mathrm{H}_{0} \tag{70}
\end{array}\right)^{1}:
$$

W e notioe that, in the long wavelength lim it,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { iQ } H_{b}^{y} \quad\left(i Q \quad H_{0}\right)^{\prime} \quad G_{0}{ }^{1} \quad r Q \quad J={ }_{0} G \quad J^{y} \quad r Q \text {; } \tag{71}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { (iQ } H_{0} \text { ) iQ } H_{b}^{y}, G_{0}{ }^{1}+r Q \quad J=G^{1}+J^{Y} \quad r Q \text {; } \tag{72}
\end{equation*}
$$

hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
& G=\left[\begin{array}{llll}
1 & G r Q & J f & G_{0} \text { iQ } H^{Y}
\end{array}\right. \\
& \text {, }\left[1+G_{0} r Q \quad J+\operatorname{Gr} Q \quad J G r Q \quad J\right] \& \quad \text { iQ } H^{H} \text {; ; } \\
& G^{Y}=\left[1+G_{0} r Q \quad J \exists G_{0}\left(\begin{array}{l}
\text { (iQ }
\end{array} H_{0}\right)\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

The leading non-vanishing contribution to (69) derives from the second order gradient correction to $G \quad G^{y}$, which reads

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{G} \quad \mathrm{G}^{\mathrm{y}}, 2 \mathrm{iGrQ} \quad \mathrm{~J} G \mathrm{G} Q \quad \mathrm{~J} \mathcal{Q} \mathrm{Q}: \tag{73}
\end{equation*}
$$

Therefore

$$
\begin{array}{rlll}
S & =\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Tr}[Q G r Q & J \operatorname{Gr} Q & J Q Q] \\
& =\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Tr} Q G r Q & J G^{Y} & r Q Q Q \tag{74}
\end{array}
$$

The only term which contributes com es from the anti-sym m etric com ponent of the tensor J $\mathrm{J}^{\mathrm{y}}$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{2} J_{i} J_{j}^{y} \quad J_{j} J_{i}^{Y}=i_{i j} V_{F} V{ }_{2} S_{1} ; \tag{75}
\end{equation*}
$$

being ${ }_{i j}$ the Levi-C ivita tensor, thus leading to

$$
\begin{align*}
& S=i^{X} \quad i ; \operatorname{Tr}\left[@_{j} Q Q \quad Q Q_{i} Q \quad{ }_{2} S_{1} \quad 3\right]  \tag{76}\\
& \text { i; }
\end{align*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{align*}
& =\frac{1}{4 V}^{\mathrm{X}} \mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{F} V} \mathrm{G}_{1}^{3}+\mathrm{G}_{2}^{3} \\
& =\frac{1}{8}_{0}^{\mathrm{Z}}{ }_{0}^{1} \mathrm{dx}^{2}{\frac{1}{\mathrm{x}^{2}+\mathrm{Q}_{0}^{2}}}^{3}=\frac{1}{16} \frac{1}{\mathrm{Q}_{0}^{4}}: \tag{77}
\end{align*}
$$

Introducing a ctitious coordinate which param etrizes the $m$ assless path, we nally get

$$
\begin{align*}
S= & i \frac{1}{12} \frac{1}{4 Q_{0}^{6}} Z^{Z} d^{3} r & \operatorname{Tr}\left[{ }_{2} S_{1}{ }_{3} Q(r) @ Q(r) Q(r) @ Q(r) Q(r) @ Q(r)\right]  \tag{78}\\
= & i \frac{1}{12} \frac{1}{4 Q_{0}^{6}} d^{3} r & \operatorname{Tr}\left[{ }_{2} S_{1} Q_{1}(r) @ Q_{1}(r) Q_{1}(r) @ Q_{1}(r) Q_{1}(r) @ Q_{1}(r)\right] \\
& i \frac{1}{12} \frac{1}{4 Q_{0}^{6}} d^{3} r & \operatorname{Tr}\left[{ }_{2} S_{1} Q_{2}(r) @ Q_{2}(r) Q_{2}(r) @ Q_{2}(r) Q_{2}(r) @ Q_{2}(r)\right]:
\end{align*}
$$

This actually represents opposite $W$ ZW term $s$ for each of the tw o pairs of nodes, nam ely for
 the tw o pairs of nodes, we would be forced to identify $Q_{1}(r)$ w ith $Q_{2}(r)$, so that the W ZW term would cancel in that case. To $m$ ake (78) $m$ ore explicit we rem ind that, for $a=1 ; 2$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q_{a}(r)=T_{a}(r)^{2} s_{3} Q_{0}=s_{3} Q_{0} T_{a}(r)^{2} ; \tag{79}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{a}}^{2}(r)=\frac{1}{2}(0+3) \mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{a}}^{2}(r)+\frac{1}{2}\left(\begin{array}{ll}
0 & 3 \tag{80}
\end{array}\right) \mathrm{C}^{\mathrm{t}} \mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{a}}^{2}(r)^{t} \mathrm{C} ;
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
V_{a}^{2}(r)=U \frac{1}{2}\left(s_{0}+s_{3}\right) e^{\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{B}} \overline{\bar{\pi}} a(r)} g_{a}(r)+\frac{1}{2}\left(s_{0} \quad s\right) e^{\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{D}} \overline{\bar{N}} a(r)} g_{a}(r)^{y} \quad U^{y} ; \tag{81}
\end{equation*}
$$

U being de ned in Eq. (B2). By m eans of (79), (80) and (81), the expression (78) can be nally w ritten as

$$
\begin{align*}
S=i \frac{1}{12}^{Z} d^{Z} d^{3} r & \operatorname{Tr} g_{1}(r)^{y} @ g_{1}(r) g_{1}(r)^{y} @ g_{1}(r) g_{1}(r)^{y} @ g_{1}(r) \\
& i \frac{1}{12}{ }^{Z} d^{3} r  \tag{82}\\
& \operatorname{Tr} g_{2}(r)^{y} @ g_{2}(r) g_{2}(r)^{y} @ g_{2}(r) g_{2}(r)^{y} @ g_{2}(r) ;
\end{align*}
$$

appropriate for two W ZW models $\mathrm{SU}(4 \mathrm{~N})_{1}$.
Let us express allother term $s$ in the action by $m$ eans of $a$ and $g_{a}$. First of all the density of state operator becom es

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{Q_{0}} \operatorname{Tr}\left[S_{3} Q(r)\right]=\operatorname{Tr} T^{2}(r)=2^{X^{2}} e^{\mathrm{i}^{\mathrm{P}} \overline{\bar{N}}{ }_{a}(r)} \operatorname{Tr}\left[g_{a}(r)\right]+e^{{ }_{i} \overline{\bar{N}} a_{a}(r)} \operatorname{Tr} g_{a}(r)^{y}: \tag{83}
\end{equation*}
$$

M oreover one readily nds that

$$
\frac{1}{Q_{0}^{2}} \operatorname{Tr} @ Q_{a}(r)^{(a)} @ Q_{a}(r)=16 @{ }_{a}(r)^{(a)} @{ }_{a}(r)+4 \operatorname{Tr} @ g_{a}(r)^{(a)} @ g_{a}(r)^{y} \text {; }
$$

and
$\frac{1}{Q_{0}^{4}} \operatorname{Tr}\left[3_{3} S_{1} Q_{a}(r) @ Q_{a}(r)\right]{ }^{(a)} \operatorname{Tr}\left[\begin{array}{ll}3 & 2 \\ S_{1} & \left.Q_{a}(r) @ Q_{a}(r)\right]=\frac{(16 N)^{2}}{N} @_{a}(r) \quad @_{a}(r): ~\end{array}\right.$
In conclusion the action expressed in term s of the fundam ental elds and including the W ZW term reads

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { X Z }
\end{aligned}
$$

w ith

$$
\begin{equation*}
S^{(a)}=\frac{1}{12}^{Z} d^{3} r \quad \operatorname{Tr} g_{a}(r)^{y} @ g_{a}(r) g_{a}(r)^{y} @ g_{a}(r) g_{a}(r)^{y} @ g_{a}(r) ; \tag{85}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the plus refers to $\mathrm{a}=1$ and the m inus to $\mathrm{a}=2$.
IX. CONSEQUENCESOFTHEW ZW TERM

W e have just show $n$ that the actual eld theory which describes $d$-w ave superconductors in the presence of a disorder which only perm its intra-node scattering processes is not a conventional non linear model but instead it represents two decoupled U (1) SU (4N \& W ZW m odels. M oreover if, for instanœ, we consider pair 1, then

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \overline{4} \frac{2}{v_{F}^{2}+v^{2}} \quad d^{2} r v_{F}^{2} \operatorname{Tr} @ g_{a}(r) @ g_{a}(r)^{y}+v^{2} \operatorname{Tr} @ g_{a}(r) @ g_{a}(r)^{y} \\
& =\frac{-}{4} \frac{1}{4_{Z}^{2}} \frac{v_{F}^{2}+v^{2}}{V_{F} v} \frac{2}{V_{F}^{2}+v^{2}} \quad d^{2} r V_{F}^{2} \operatorname{Tr} @ g_{a}(r) @ g_{a}(r)^{y}+v^{2} \operatorname{Tr} @ g_{a}(r) @ g_{a}(r)^{Y} \\
& =\frac{1}{8} \frac{d^{2} r}{V_{F} v} v_{F}^{2} \operatorname{Tr} @ g_{a}(r) @ g_{a}(r)^{y}+v^{2} \operatorname{Tr} @ g_{a}(r) @ g_{a}(r)^{y} ;
\end{aligned}
$$

which, upon the change of variable ! vand ! v, shows that each W ZW m odel is right at its xed point. H ence there is no am biguity in the zero replica lim it.

N ow we can draw som e consequences ofw hat we have found. T he rst is that the average value of the density of states (DOS) at the chem icalpotential stays zero, as in the absence of disorder and contrary to the B om approxim ation. In particular the dim ension of the density of states operator in the zero replica $\lim$ it N ! 0 is

$$
Q=\frac{\mathrm{N}}{\mathrm{~N}}+\frac{1}{\mathrm{~N}(1+\mathrm{N})}!1
$$

while the dim ension of the frequency is [!]=2 $(1 \quad)=1+\quad$. This implies that the DOS at nite frequency behaves as

$$
\begin{equation*}
N(!) \quad j!\frac{1}{\frac{1}{3+}} \text {; } \tag{86}
\end{equation*}
$$

in agreem ent w ith $R$ ef. [19].
N otioe the (86) stem s from the fact that the W ZW term smodi es the non-linear m odel results leading to Eq. (66) in two ways: i) it makes unrenorm alized as well as, ii) it adds the further contribution one to the dim ension of the density of states operator. T he only di erence between the 1d mapping and the non-linear m odel results for the density of states are the constant factors $x e d$ by the range of validity. 1d mapping: $N$ (!) $1=\left(\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{F}} \mathrm{V}\right)!(!=)^{2=(1+)} \mathrm{W}$ th $!<\quad ;$ non-linear model: $\left.\mathrm{N}(!) \quad \mathrm{N}_{0}(!)^{(1)} \quad\right)=(1+)$ with ! < $1=0, N_{0}$ being the saddle point value of the density of states. At leading ording in $u^{2}$ the $m$ atching of the two expressions is provided by $N_{0} 0_{0}$

T he second consequence concems the transport properties. W e have show $n$ that w ithin the B om approxim ation a nite spin-conductivity arises. Is this result still true beyond that approxim ation? The renorm alization group analysis which identi es the spin conductivity w ith the coupling of the non-linear m odel would say that s stays unrenorm alized to its xed point value. $C$ an we understand this in the 1 dm apping language?.
In order to answ er this question, we introduce a unform spin vector potentialw ithin the action, whidh in our path-integral approach has the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
A=A_{0}+A_{1}{ }_{3} S_{1}: \tag{87}
\end{equation*}
$$

The action becom es now a functional ofA, i.e. $S!S(A)$, and the spin-conductivity tums out to be given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{s}=\frac{1}{2} \frac{\varrho^{2} \ln Z(A)}{@_{0}^{2} ;} \quad \frac{@^{2} \ln Z(A)}{@ A_{1 ;}^{2}}=\frac{1}{2} \frac{@^{2} \ln Z(A)}{@_{0}^{2}} \quad \frac{@_{0}^{2} \ln Z(A)}{@_{1}^{2} ;} \quad A=0 \quad ; \tag{88}
\end{equation*}
$$

where Z

$$
Z(A)=D Q(r)^{S(A)}
$$

is the generating functionalin the presence of A. It is possible to show that at second order in $A$ one needs just to $m$ ake the follow ing substitution in the action

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.@ Q(r)!@ Q(r)+\frac{i}{2} Q(r) ; A\right]: \tag{89}
\end{equation*}
$$

Upon the action of (32)

$$
A!U^{\mathrm{Y}} \mathrm{~A} U=A_{0} \quad 3+A_{1} \quad 3 \quad 2 S_{3}
$$

and we can show that (89) im plies the follow ing transform ation law of the $m$ atrix eld $G(r)$ in the presence of A

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{G}(r)!e^{\frac{i}{2} \int d r^{0}\left(A_{0}\left(r^{0}\right) 3_{1} A_{1}\left(r^{0}\right) 2^{3}\right)} \mathrm{G}(r) \mathrm{e}^{\frac{i}{2} \int \mathrm{dr}}{ }^{0}\left(A_{0}\left(r^{0}\right)_{3}+\mathrm{A}_{1}\left(r^{0}\right)_{2}{ }^{3}\right): \tag{90}
\end{equation*}
$$

In order to better understand the role of A it is convenient to translate the W ZW action into the language of the undemeath free one-dim ensional ferm ions. O ne m ay identify the com ponent $G_{1 ;}(r)$ of the $m$ atrix eld for pair $\backslash 1$ ", where and run over 4 N indioes, w ith

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{G}_{1 ;} \quad(\mathrm{r})!\mathrm{i}_{1 ; \mathrm{R}}(\mathrm{r}) \underset{1 ; \mathrm{L}}{\mathrm{y}}(\mathrm{r}) \text {; } \tag{91}
\end{equation*}
$$

being $1 ; \mathrm{R}(r)$ and $1 ; \mathrm{L}(r)$ right and left $m$ oving one dim ensionalFerm i elds, respectively, and the two com ponent vector r playing the role of space and tim e coordinates. Since pair $\backslash 2$ " has the opposite $W$ ZW term of pair \1", it is m ore appropriate to de ne

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{G}_{2 ;} \quad(\mathrm{r})!\quad \mathrm{i}_{2 ; \mathrm{L}} \quad(\mathrm{r}) \underset{2 ; \mathrm{R}}{\mathrm{y}}(\mathrm{r}) \text {; } \tag{92}
\end{equation*}
$$

which form ally yields to equalW ZW term $s$. Then (90) im plies for the ferm ions the transform ation law s

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left.1_{1 ; R}(r)!e^{\frac{i}{2} \int d r^{0}\left(A_{0}\left(r^{0}\right)\right.} \begin{array}{l}
3 \\
A_{1}\left(r^{0}\right) \\
2
\end{array} 3^{3}\right) \quad 1 ; \mathbb{R}(r) ;
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left.2_{2 ; R}(r)!e^{\frac{i}{2} \int d r^{0}\left(A_{0}\left(r^{0}\right){ }_{3}+A_{1}\left(r^{0}\right)\right.} 2^{3}\right) \quad 2 ; R(r) ; \\
& \left.2 ; \mathrm{L}(r)!e^{\frac{i}{2} \int d r^{0}\left(A_{0}\left(r^{0}\right)\right.} 3 A_{1}\left(r^{0}\right) \quad 23\right) \quad 2 ; \mathrm{L}(r) ;
\end{aligned}
$$

which we may interpret as if $A_{0}$ couples to the spin-density operator

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{X} \\
& \mathrm{i}=1 ; 2 \tag{93}
\end{align*} \underset{\mathrm{i} ; \mathrm{R}}{\mathrm{y}}(\mathrm{r}) \quad 3 \quad \underset{\mathrm{i} ; \mathrm{R}}{ }(\mathrm{r})+\underset{\mathrm{i} ; \mathrm{L}}{\mathrm{y}}(\mathrm{r}) \quad 3 \quad \underset{i ; L}{ }(r) ;
$$

while $A_{1}$ to the spin-current operator

Since the ferm ions are free, apart from the abelian sector which is not coupled to A, the susceptibility tow ards $A_{0}$ is the sam e as that tow ards $A_{1}$, hence the spin-conductivity w ould seem to vanish at! strictly equal to zero, again unlike what we found within the Bom
approxim ation. A ctually one has to be $m$ ore careful in draw ing such a conclusion. Let us suppose to do the sam e calculation at nite frequency ! and afterwards send! ! 0. A frequency ! 0 plays the role of an explicit dim erization in the one dim ensional ferm ionic problem :

It is straightforw ard to show that in the presence of a nite dim erization the current-current susceptibility is nite and practically equal to that one in the absence of dimerization, while the density-density susceptibility is zero. This discontinuous behavior at ! = 0 as opposed to ! ! 0 is again a manifestation of the chiral anom aly which plays such an im portant role in this problem $\underline{\underline{19}}$. Since it is physically m ore appropriate to identify the spin conductanœ through the ! ! 0 lim it, we conclude that, in spite of the vanishing DOS, the spin conductivity is nite. In other words, in spite of the fact that the DOS is vanishing at the chem ical potential, nam ely that quasiparticle $m$ otion is undam ped hence rem ains ballistic, yet the spin conductivity acquires a nite value in agreem ent with the D rude approxim ation.

## X. INTER -NODE SCATTERING PROCESSES

So far we have just considered the role of im purity scattering within each node. N ow let us extend our analysis by including also inter-node scattering processes. Upon integrating out the m ost general disorder, we nd two additional term s. The rst describes opposite node scattering processes, and it reads:

Z

The second derives from the im purity scattering processes which couple the tw o pairs of nodes, and it is given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Z }
\end{aligned}
$$

As before we can decouple the four-ferm ion term s by introducing auxiliary HubbardStratonovich elds. Since these elds are expected to be m assive, we can further expand the
action up to second order in those elds after integrating out ferm ions. We nally integrate on the auxiliary $m$ assive elds. The net result is still an action for the Q matrioes only which includes now the additional term s:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.S_{\mathrm{imp}}^{\mathrm{I}}=\frac{\mathrm{N}}{0}_{\mathrm{Q}_{0}}^{\mathrm{Z}} \mathrm{dr} \operatorname{Tr} \mathrm{Q}(r)_{1 Q} \mathrm{Q}(\mathrm{r})_{1}\right] ; \tag{98}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{\text {im } p}^{\text {II }}=\quad{\frac{N I}{Q_{0}}}_{Q_{0}}^{Z} d r \underbrace{X}_{i=0 ; 1} \operatorname{Tr} Q(r) \quad 1 \quad i Q(r) \quad 1 \quad i] ; \tag{99}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\text { I } \frac{\mathrm{v}^{2}}{\mathrm{u}^{2}} ; \quad \text { II } \quad \frac{\mathrm{w}^{2}}{\mathrm{u}^{2}}:
$$

The rst term (98) tends to lock $G_{1}=G_{\overline{1}}$ and $G_{2}=G_{\overline{2}}$, while (99) locks $G_{1}=G_{2}$.
W hen opposite node scattering is added, still leaving pairs of opposite nodes uncoupled, only the sym $m$ etric $Q$-com binations of opposite nodes stay $m$ assless, the -term disappears and the coset for soft $m$ odes is $\mathrm{Sp}(2 \mathrm{~N}$ ) for each pair of nodes. The -function is vanishing only because of the contribution of the W ZW term, and density of states vanishes with a universal exponent in agreem ent with the known results, 19,22 . In the absence of isotropic scattering the vanishing of the function still indicates that the spin and heat conductivities have a m etallic behavior.

F inally, in the generic case in which all nodes are coupled only the four nodes sym $m$ etric com bination of the $Q$ ' $s$ is required for the soft $m$ odes. The coset is again $\operatorname{Sp}(2 N)$, but now it represents degrees of freedom com ing from all nodes. The two W ZW term sare written in term s of the sam e $Q$ and they cancels since they have opposite sign. T he action then reduce to the $S_{\text {NL }}$ m as derived by [5].
A. Scaling analysis of the generalm odel

In order to elucidate the role of inter-node scattering processes, it is convenient to transform the 2 dim ensional non-linear $m$ odel into a $1+1$ dim ensional $m$ odel of interacting ferm ions.


F IG . 1: Interaction vertioes for the $m$ ost general disorder. Solid (dashed) lines refer to right (left) $m$ oving ferm ions. The label $i=1 ; 2$ refers to the two pairs of opposite nodes, ; ${ }^{0}=1$ to the two N am bu components, $;{ }^{0}=" ; \#$ to the spin and $a ; a^{0}=1 ;::: ; \mathrm{N}$ to the replicas. The symbol 0 in front of the $g_{3}$ and $g_{3 b}$ coupling constants $m$ eans +1 if $=0$ and -1 otherw ise.
$W$ e represent the $m$ atrix elds for pair $\backslash 1$ " according to:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{G}_{1 ;} \quad \mathrm{a} ; 0 \mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{a}^{0}}=\mathrm{i}{ }_{1 ; \mathrm{R}} ; \quad \mathrm{a}{\underset{1 ; \mathrm{L}}{\mathrm{y}} ; 0 \mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{a}} 0} \text {; } \\
& \mathrm{G}_{1 ;}^{\mathrm{Y}} \quad \mathrm{a} ; 0 \mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{a}}=\mathrm{i}_{1 ; \mathrm{L} ;} \quad \text { a }{ }_{1 ; R ; 0}^{\mathrm{Y}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{a}} 0 \text {; } \\
& \mathrm{G}_{\overline{1} ;} \quad a ; 00_{a^{0}}=1 \quad 2 G_{1}^{Y} 2100 a^{0} ; \quad a  \tag{100}\\
& =i^{0}{ }_{1 ; L} ; 00_{a}{ }^{0}{ }_{1 ; R}^{y} ; \quad a
\end{align*}
$$

A s we m entioned, since pair \2" has the opposite W ZW term of pair $\backslash 1$ ", it is convenient
 equal leaving no am biguity in $m$ apping the non-linear $m$ odelonto a one-dim ensionalm odel of interacting electrons w ith the interaction vertiges drawn in Fig. 1 . W e notice that the coupling $g$ in $F$ ig. 1 derives from the two term $s$ in Eq. (64). The bare values of the coupling constants are approxim ately

$$
\begin{aligned}
& g^{(0)}, u^{2} ; \\
& g_{3}^{(0)}, v^{2} ; \\
& g_{b}^{(0)}=g_{3 b}^{(0)}, w^{2}:
\end{aligned}
$$

Generally $u^{2} \quad w^{2} \quad v^{2}$, the equality holding only for short range im purity potential. An im portant observation is that two-loop corrections to the renorm alization group (RG)
equations vanish in the zero replica lim it, hence the RG equations valid up to two-loops are found to be:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d g}{d \ln s}=g_{3}^{2}+g_{b}^{2}+g_{3 b}^{2} ; \\
& \frac{d g_{3}}{d \ln s}=4 g g_{3}+4 g_{b} g_{3 b} ; \\
& \frac{d g_{b}}{d \ln s}=2 g g_{b}+2 g_{3} g_{3 b} ; \\
& \frac{d g_{3 b}}{d \ln s}=2 g_{3} g_{b}+2 g_{3 b} g ;
\end{aligned}
$$

where $s!1$ is the scaling param eter. A s discussed in Ref. [20], the velocity anisotropy does not enter the RG equations, which rem ains true at least up to tw o loops in our ferm ion ic replica tridk approach. It is convenient to de ne $g=g_{3 b} \Phi, s o$ that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d g}{d \ln s}=g_{3}^{2}+\frac{1}{2} g_{+}^{2}+g^{2} ; \\
& \frac{d g_{3}}{d \ln s}=4 g g_{3}+g_{+}^{2} \quad g^{2} ; \\
& \frac{d g_{+}}{d \ln s}=2\left(g+g_{3}\right) g_{+} ; \\
& \frac{d g}{d \ln s}=2(g \quad g) g:
\end{aligned}
$$

G iven the appropriate bare values of the am plinudes, one readily recognizes that the RG ow $m$ aintains the initial condition $g=0$, hence the scaling equations reduce to

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{d g}{d \ln s}=g_{3}^{2}+\frac{1}{2} g_{+}^{2} ;  \tag{101}\\
& \frac{d g_{3}}{d \ln s}=4 g g_{3}+g_{+}^{2} ;  \tag{102}\\
& \frac{d g_{+}}{d \ln s}=2\left(g+g_{3}\right) g_{+}: \tag{103}
\end{align*}
$$

The RG equations w th the appropriate intial conditions always ow to strong coupling w ith

$$
g_{3} \quad 2 g \quad g!\frac{1}{3} \frac{1}{\ln s_{c} \ln s} ;
$$

where $S_{c}$ can be intenpreted as the correlation length of the $m$ odes which acquire a $m$ ass gap $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{c}}$ by the interaction, with

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{c}, \frac{p \overline{V_{F} V}}{S_{C}}: \tag{104}
\end{equation*}
$$

Therefore the two pairs of nodes get strongly coupled, in agreem ent w ith Refs. [19, 20, 22].
B. Strong coupling analysis

In order to gain further insight into the strong coupling phase tow ards which RG ow S, let us consider the case of a single replica $N=1$. For further simpli cation it is convenient to adopt the sam e approach as in Refs. 5, 19, 20, 22 and neglect the role of the opposite frequencies, which am ounts to drop the -label. The m odel thus reduces to tw o interacting chains of spinful ferm ions, each chain representing a pair of nodes. The coupling $g$ off ig. 1 only couples to the charge sector and $m$ akes the intra-chain um klapp, the coupling $g_{3}$, $a$ relevant perturbation which opens a charge gap on each chain. Therefore the $m$ odel is equivalent to tw o coupled spin $-1 / 2$ chains. If we denote by $\mathrm{r}_{1(2)}(\mathrm{x})$ and $\mathrm{I}_{(2)}(\mathrm{x})$ respectively the staggered $m$ agnetization and the dim erization of chain $1(2)$, the coupling am ong the chains is ferrom agnetic and given by

$$
\mathrm{w}^{2} \quad \mathrm{dx}{ }_{1}(\mathrm{x})_{2}(\mathrm{x}) \quad 4 \mathrm{r}_{1}(\mathrm{x}) \quad \mathrm{P}(\mathrm{x}):
$$

A s show $n$ in $R$ ef. 29 , this $m$ odel is equivalent to an $S O$ (4) $G$ ross $N$ eveau which tums out to be fully m assive or, equivalently, by four tw o-dim ensional o critical classical Ising models, three ordered and one disordered, $h_{1} i=h_{2} i=h_{3} i=h_{4} i=0$, where $i$ and ir $i=1 ;::: ; 4$, are order and disorder param eters, respectively. The ground state is rigid to an extemalm agnetic eld and to a spin vector potential opposite for the tw o chains, hence the conductivity is zero. A s we discussed, a nite frequency am ounts to add a term

$$
!^{\text {Z }} \quad \mathrm{dx}{ }_{1}(\mathrm{x})+{ }_{2}(\mathrm{x}) /!^{\mathrm{Z}} \mathrm{dx}{ }_{1}(\mathrm{x})_{2}(\mathrm{x})_{3}(\mathrm{x})_{4}(\mathrm{x})^{\prime} \quad!^{3} \quad \mathrm{dx}{ }_{4}(\mathrm{x}) \text {; }
$$

which actually plays the role of an extemalm agnetic eld acting on the fourth disordered Ising copy. The net result is that $h_{4}(x) i_{!_{0}} \quad!$, which in tumsm ean that the D O S rem ains linear in frequency. Even in the presence of an explicit dim erization, the susceptibilities tow ards a m agnetic eld or tow ards a spin vector potential opposite for the tw o chains still vanish. W ere these results valid for any $N$, even for $N$ ! 0 , we should conclude that i) the m odel is indeed insulating; ii) the D O $S$ is linear in frequency, in filllagreem ent with $\mathrm{Ref}$.6 .

## C. Identi cation of relevant energy scales

The previous analysis of the $\mathrm{N}=1 \mathrm{~m}$ odel show s that the vanishing of them al and spin conductivities in them odelfor a disordered d-w ave superconductor translates in the language
of the e ective one-dim ensional ferm ionic $m$ odel into the existence of a nite spin-gap. The correlation length associated w ith this gap should then represent the localization length of the Bogoliubov quasiparticles. $W$ e $m$ ay estim ate this correlation length as the scale $\mathrm{s}_{\mathrm{c}}$ at which the RG equations (101)103) encounter a singularity. In addition we may introduce them ass gap $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{c}}$ through Eq. (104) which can be identi ed as the energy scale around which localization e ects appear. It is worth noticing that s underestim ates the spin correlation length, hence the actual localization length. T he reason is that the RG equations blow up on a scale which is related to the largest gap in the excitation spectrum. Since the coupling $g$ only a ects charge degrees of freedom, the largest gap is expected in the charge sector, the spin gap being sm aller. K eeping this in $m$ ind, in what follow $s$ we shall discuss how $S_{c}$, or better $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{c}}$, depend on the range of the disorder potential.
$F$ irst of all we need to identify som e reference scale to com pare with $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{c}}$. The natural candidate would be the inverse relaxation tim e $1=0$ in the Bom approxim ation. In the generic case $u^{2} w^{2} \quad v^{2}, 1=0=2 Q_{0}$ where $Q_{0}$ is obtained by Eq. (56) w ith $u^{2}$ substituted by $u^{2}+2 w^{2}+v^{2}$. W e expect that the actual $E_{c}$ is alw ays sm aller then $1=0$, the two values being closest for extrem ely short-range disorder, nam ely $u^{2}=w^{2}=v^{2}$. Since the derivation of the non-linear $m$ odeldoes not provide $w$ ith the precise dependence of the initial values of the coupling constants, $g^{(0)}, g_{3}^{(0)}$ and $g_{+}^{(0)}$, on the im purity potential, we will assum e that the short range disorder corresponds to $2 g^{(0)}=g_{3}^{(0)}=g_{+}^{(0)}$ and $m$ oreover that the $m$ ass gap $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{c}}$ in this case can be identi ed as $1=0$ in the Bom approxim ation. U pon integrating the RG equations (101 103) w ith this intial condition, the value of $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{c}}{ }^{\prime} 1=0$ is found to be

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{0}, \quad \exp \frac{1}{2 g^{(0)}+g_{3}^{(0)}+g_{+}^{(0)}} ; \tag{105}
\end{equation*}
$$

where is the ultraviolet cut-o of the order of the gap. In order to appreciate the role of the range of the disorder-potential, let us analyze the RG equations (101-103) keeping xed the combination $g=2 g^{(0)}+g_{3}^{(0)}+g_{+}^{(0)}$, i.e. at constant $1={ }_{0}$, and increasing the value of $g^{(0)}$ at expenses of $g_{3}^{(0)}+g_{+}^{(0)}=g_{0} \quad 2 g^{(0)}$. O ne readily realizes that as $g^{(0)}$ increases $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{c}}$ decreases from its short-range value (105). For instance, if we assum e $\mathrm{g}_{3}^{(0)}=0$ and $g_{+}^{(0)}=g_{0} \quad 2 g^{(0)} \quad g_{0}$, then

$$
\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{c}}, \frac{1}{0} \frac{\mathrm{eg}}{+}_{(0)}^{4 g_{0}}{ }^{!\frac{1}{9_{0}}} \quad \frac{1}{0} ;
$$

which explicitly show sthat localization e ects $m$ ay show up at energies/tem peratures $m$ uch
sm aller than the $1=0$ in the $B$ om approxim ation.

## XI. CONCLUSIONS

In this work we have presented a derivation of the non-linear model for disordered $d-w$ ave superconductors able to dealw ith a nite range im purity potential, nam ely w ith an intra-node scattering potential generically di erent from the inter-nodal one. W ithin this derivation we have been able to clarify som e controversial issues conceming the validity of a conventional non-linear m odel approach when dealing with disordered D irac ferm ions. W e have indeed found that the non-linear m odel approach is actually equivalent to the altemative $m$ ethod rst introduced in Ref. 19 which consists in $m$ apping the disordered m odel onto a one-dim ensional model of interacting ferm ions. The energy upper cut-o is provided by the inverse Bom relaxation time $1=0$ in the non-linear $m$ odel approach and by the superconducting gap in the 1d m apping. A closely related aspect which also em erges for d-wave superconductors is the existence of a $W$ ess-Zum ino-N ovikov-W itten term related to the vorticity of the spectrum in $m$ om entum space. B oth these features are responsible of several interesting phenom ena. For instance, unlike conventional disordered system $s$, in this case disorder starts playing a role (particularly in the density of states) when quasiparticle $m$ otion is still ballistic. In contrast, the on-set of localization precursor $e$ ects is pushed towards energies/tem peratures lower than the inverse relaxation tim e in the $D$ rude approxim ation. M ore speci cally, the longer is the range of the im purity potential the later localization e ects appear. This result $m$ ay explain why experim ents have so often failed to detect localization precursor e ects in cuprates superoonductors.
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