# Role of the impurity-potential range in disordered d-wave superconductors

Luca Dell'Anna,<sup>1</sup> M ichele Fabrizio,<sup>2,3</sup> and C laudio Castellani<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Institut fur Theoretische Physik, Heinrich-

Heine-Universitat, D-40225 Dusseldorf, Germany

<sup>2</sup>International School for Advanced Studies (SISSA),

Via Beirut 2-4, I-34014 Trieste, Italy

<sup>3</sup>The Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics (ICTP),

P.O.Box 586, I-34014 Trieste, Italy

<sup>4</sup>D ipartim ento di Fisica, Universita di Roma "La Sapienza",

and INFM-SMC, Piazzale Aldo Moro 2, I-00185 Roma, Italy

(D ated: D ecem ber 21, 2021)

#### Abstract

We analyze how the range of disorder a ects the localization properties of quasiparticles in a twodimensionald-wave superconductor within the standard non-linear -m odel approach to disordered systems. We show that for purely long-range disorder, which only induces intra-node scattering processes, the approach is free from the ambiguities which often beset the disordered D irac-ferm ion theories, and gives rise to a Wess-Zum ino-N ovikov-W itten action leading to vanishing density of states and nite conductivities. We also study the crossover induced by internode scattering due to a short range component of the disorder, thus providing a coherent non-linear -m odel description in agreement with all the various noings of dimensional approaches.

PACS numbers: 7420.-z, 7425Fy, 7123An, 72.15Rn, 74.72-h Keywords: Disordered systems (Theory), Sigma models (Theory)

### I. IN TRODUCTION

The low-tem perature quasiparticle transport in two-dimensional d-wave superconductors like cuprates is a fascinating issue due to the presence of four nodes in the energy spectrum of the Bogoliubov quasiparticles, around which the low-lying excitations have a D irac-like dispersion. W ithin the self-consistent C oherent-P hase-A pproximation in the limit of weak disorder, spin and thermal conductivities are found to be related by a W iedem ann-Franz law and to acquire universal values which do not depend on the disorder strength.<sup>1</sup> Inclusion of quantum interference in the fram ework of the standard non-linear -m odel approach to disordered system  $s^{2,3}$  leads to a variety of universality classes<sup>4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11</sup>. In the \generic" case of short-ranged non magnetic in purities full localization of Bogoliubov quasiparticles is predicted.<sup>5</sup>

Nevertheless, with the only exceptions of YBCO  $(124)^{12}$  and Pr<sub>2 x</sub>Ce<sub>x</sub>CuO<sub>4</sub><sup>13</sup>, experim ents in cuprates m aterials like YBCO  $(123)^{14,15,16}$ , BSCCO  $(2212)^{15}$  and LSCO<sup>17</sup> do not show any evidence of strong or even weak localization in the superconducting phase down to 0.1 K elvin. Various physical elects m ay be invoked to explain the disagreem ent between theory and experiments.

For instance one may argue that the origin of the discrepancy are spin- ip scattering events, even though the systems are nominally free from magnetic in purities. Indeed, in the presence of spin- ips, the non-linear -m odel predicts that quantum interference has a debcalizing e ecc<sup>2</sup>. A lternatively, or in addition, strong dephasing processes might set the tem perature scale for the onset of localization e ects below the experimentally accessed region. This question has not been settled yet<sup>18</sup>. Residual interactions among quasiparticles can also favor delocalization<sup>9,11</sup>, 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 Born approximation, is very small.

A nother possible explanation invokes the range of the in purity potential. In the case of purely long range disorder, forward processes dom inate and scattering occurs mainly within each node. In the extrem e case of intra-node scattering only, it has been show  $n^{19,20}$  that the density of states behaves quite di erently from the isotropic-scattering case. In addition the eigenstates have been argued<sup>20</sup> to be delocalized, unlike for short-range in purity potential. E ven though real disorder will always have an isotropic component which provides scattering

am ong all four nodes, and eventually drive the system to localization, one m ight argue that a large value of the intranode with respect to the internode scattering could lower the crossover tem perature for the appearance of localization precursor e 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<sup>21</sup>. This is not surprising since superconducting cuprates are intrinsically disordered by the out-of-plane charge dopants which m ainly provide a long-range disordered potential. Further doping with iso-valent in purities which substitute inplane C u-ions only adds a short-range component on top of the pre-existing long-range tail of the disordered potential.

The results in the presence of purely intra-node impurity scattering have been obtained<sup>19,20</sup> within an approach which is conceptually di erent from the standard non-linear -model approach to disordered systems. The latter starts from the Born approximation, ie. from in purity-dam ped quasiparticles, and treats perturbatively what is beyond that, ie. quantum interference e ects on the di usive motion. On the contrary, the alternative methods used in Refs. [19,20] do not rely on the Born approximation but just map the action of ballistic nodal-quasiparticles in the presence of disorder onto the action of one-dimensional (1d) ferm ions in the presence of an interaction, which is generated by the disorder average. W ithin the mapping, one of the two spatial dimensions transforms into the time coordinate of the 1d m odel while the other into the 1d spatial coordinate. The nalm odel is then analyzed by abelian and non-abelian bosonization. The outcome of this analysis is that for purely intra-node or inter-opposite-node disorder, where essentially exact results can be obtained<sup>19,20</sup>, the density of states is power-law vanishing at the chem ical potential with 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 motion never sets in, namely quasiparticles move ballistically down to zero energy. When the disorder also couples ad jacent nodes, strong coupling arguments are invoked<sup>20</sup> which predict localization of quasiparticles and linearly vanishing density of states. Yet, even this case seems to suggest a scenario in which quasiparticle motion from ballistic turns directly into localized without crossing any intermediate di usive regime.

The standard non-linear -m odel approach applies the replica trick to average over disorder from the outset. The resulting ferm ion interaction is then decoupled by introducing Q-matrix elds in terms of which an elective action is derived after integrating out the

ferm ions. The saddle point solution is just the Born approximation, which provides, in the case of nodal Bogoliubov quasiparticles, a nite density of states hence a nite damping. Finally, long-wavelength transverse uctuations are taken with respect to the saddle point leading to a non-linear -m odel action for the Q-m atrix elds. However, unlike in conventional disordered systems, in this particular case an additional term may appear in the non-linear -m odel action, namely a so-called W ezz-Zum ino-N ovikov-W itten (W ZW ) term. It was actually argued<sup>7,20,22</sup> that two opposite nodes share the same W ZW term, while two adjacent ones have opposite W ZW term s. As a consequence, when the two pairs of opposite nodes are uncoupled by disorder the W ZW term is elective and the -function of the spin-conductance ows towards an interm ediate-coupling 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 more protection against ow ing towards a zero-conductance strong coupling regin e characterized by a linearly vanishing density of states<sup>6</sup>.

From the above discussion one might be lead to conclude that the agreem ent between the conclusions drawn with either methods is merely an accident which does not justify per se the conventional non-linear -m odel approach when dealing with D irac ferm ions. The main objection against the conventional non-linear -m odel is that it is not appropriate to start from a symmetry breaking saddle-point solution, associated to a mean-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 method which starts by assuming a di usive behavior if at the end it is discovered that a di usive requine never appears. This criticism could invalidate also the results obtained with isotropic scattering, even though in this case the dimensionless coupling of the non-linear -m odel can be made small<sup>23</sup> by assuming a large anisotropy of the Dirac dispersion (i.e. the velocities along and orthogonal to the Ferm i surface). A related objection that can be raised is that the non-linear -m odel approach to disordered system s is commonly believed to be valid for length scales longer than the mean free path and energy scales smaller 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= , namely in the regime when quasiparticle motion should

be still ballistic.

It is the scope of the present work to clear up these inconsistencies of the non-linear – m odel approach to disordered d-wave supercondutors. We will demonstrate that the above, apparently contradicting, approaches can be actually reconciled. This is of particular interest since it provides further support to the standard non-linear -m odel approach based on the replica trick within the ferm ionic path-integral form alism, which remains so far one of the few available tools to deal with disorder in generic situations with a Ferm i sea of interacting quasiparticles. Let us brie y summarize our main results.

First we are going to present a simple and straightforward way to extract the W ZW term . Indeed it is well known how to derive the W ZW term within eld theories de ned on a continuous space with D irac-like dispersing particles. However in disordered lattice models the existence of such a term is not at all a common situation. We will show that the W ZW term energes quite naturally within the conventional derivation of the non-linear -m odel for disordered systems as a consequence of the non-analytical properties of the spectrum within the B rillouin zone. More speci cally, the spin-current density in momentum space,  $J_k$ , in a d-wave superconductor is a 2 2 matrix 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 measure of the vorticity around each node. In the presence of purely intra-node in purity scattering we obtain the same W ZW action of the non-abelian bosonization from the 1d m apping<sup>19,20</sup>, with how ever the inverse mean free path as a momentum upper cut-o instead of the inverse lattice spacing which is usual the U ltra-V iolet-regularizer of the 1d 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 in purity-potential range.

A nother issue we clarify is the relationship between the coupling constant of the nonlinear -m odel and the actual spin-conductance. The two quantities are known to coincide at the level of the Born approximation. However, rigorously speaking, the spin-conductance has to be calculated through a K ubo form ula which involves advanced and retarded G reen's functions. Since it makes a di erence whether quasiparticles are right at the nodal points, with zero density of states, or slightly away from them, in which case the density of states is nite, one might wander whether the two quantities, spin-conductance and non-linear -m odel coupling, remain equal even beyond the Born approximation, especially in the case of intra-node and inter-opposite-node scattering. W e will show that this is actually the case.

Finally we will show that the range of the in purity potential crucially a ects the energy scale at which localization precursor e ects starts to appear. In particular we will explicitly show that, keeping xed the inverse relaxation time within the Born approximation,  $1=_0$ , and increasing the relative weight of the long-range with 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 may provide a natural explanation to the partial lack of experimental evidences of quasiparticle localization in superconducting cuprates.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section II we introduce the model which we reform ulate within the ferm ionic path-integral form alism using the replica trick in Section III. The global symmetries of the action are discussed in Section IV. In Section V we start the derivation of the non-linear -model which includes two terms. The \conventional" one is worked out in Section V I, and its drawbacks discussed in Section V II. The \unconventional" W ZW term is derived in Section V III and its consequences for intra-modal disorder are discussed in Section IX. In Section X we analyse the role of inter-modal scattering processes and nally Section X I is devoted to the concluding remarks.

#### II. THE MODEL

The model we study is described by an Hartree-Fock Hamiltonian for d-wave superconductors in the presence of disorder

Here V (q) is the impurity potential,  $_{k}^{Y} = (c_{k}^{Y}; c_{k\#})$  the Nambu spinor,  $_{k} = (\cos k_{x}a \cos k_{y}a)=2$  the superconducting gap with d-wave symmetry and  $_{k}$  the band-dispersion measured with respect to the chemical potential. The Paulim atrices  $_{i}$ 's, i = 1;2;3, act on the Nambu spinor components. The spectrum of the Bogolubov quasiparticles is given by

$$E_{k} = \frac{q}{k} + \frac{2}{k}; \qquad (2)$$

and shows four nodal points at  $k_1 = k_F (1;1) = \frac{p}{2}$ ,  $k_{\overline{1}} = k_1$ ,  $k_2 = k_F (1;1) = \frac{p}{2}$  and  $k_{\overline{2}} = k_2$ ,  $k_F$  being the Ferm in one ntum along the diagonals of the Brillouin zone. A round

the nodes it is actually more convenient to rotate the axes by 45 degrees through

$$k = \frac{1}{p_{\overline{2}}} (k_x + k_y); \quad k = \frac{1}{p_{\overline{2}}} (k_y - k_x):$$
 (3)

In the new reference frame,  $k_1 = k_F$  (1;0) and  $k_2 = k_F$  (0;1). In what follows we de ne

the momentum deviation from any of the four nodal points  $k_a$ ,  $a = 1;\overline{1};2;\overline{2}$ . For small  $j j = k_F$  the spectrum around nodes  $1(\overline{1})$  and  $2(\overline{2})$  is, respectively,

$$E_{k_{1}+}$$
  $E_{1}$   $' \frac{q}{v_{F}^{2}} + v^{2}$ ; (5)

$$E_{k_2+}$$
  $E_2$   $' v_F^{2-2} + v^{2-2};$  (6)

thus having a conical D irac-like form . Here  $v_F$  = jr  $_{k_a}$  j and v = jr  $_{k_a}$  j.

In the presence of disorder the motion of the gapless quasiparticles may become di usive in the hydrodynamic regime. However di usive propagators appear only in those channels which refer to conserved quantities. Hence, in superconductors, only thermal and spin density uctuations might 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 important role in our analysis.

The z-component of the spin-current operator in the Nambu representation satis es

hence, for q ! 0,

$$J_k(q) ! J_k r_{k-3} + r_{k-1}$$
: (8)

Since the Paulim atrices anticom mute, the following vector product turns out to be non-zero

$$J_k \wedge J_k = 2i_2 r_k \wedge r_k$$
 (9)

The vector product (9) actually probes the vorticity of the spectrum in momentum space; nodes \1" and  $\overline{1}$ " have the same vorticity,  $J_k \wedge J_k ! 2i_2 v_F v$ , as well as nodes \2" and  $\overline{2}$ ", although opposite of node 1",  $J_k \wedge J_k ! 2i_2 v_F v$ . We are going to show that this property is crucial to uncover the physical behavior in the presence of disorder. To analyze the e ect of disorder in this model, we are going to use a replica trick method within the ferm ionic path-integral approach. For that we associate to each ferm ionic operator G rassm ann variables through

$$q_k^y \mid \overline{q}_k; q_k \mid q_k:$$

Notice that, unlike the original ferm ionic operators,  $\bar{q}_k$  and  $q_k$  are independent variables. A fler introducing the Nambu spinors

$$-\frac{0}{n_{k}} = (\overline{c}_{k}"(\underline{i}!_{n}); c_{k}"(\underline{i}!_{n})); \quad n_{k} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ C_{k}"(\underline{i}!_{n}) & \overline{c}_{k} \\ \overline{c}_{k}"(\underline{i}!_{n}) & \overline{c}_{k} \end{pmatrix} ;$$

where  $\bar{q}_k$  (i!<sub>n</sub>) and  $q_k$  (i!<sub>n</sub>) are the G rassmann variables in M atsubara frequencies, the path-integral action without disorder reads

$$S_{0} = \frac{X X}{_{nk} [_{k} _{3} + _{k} _{1} i!_{n}]_{nk}};$$
(10)

The disorder introduces the additional term

$$S_{imp} = \bigvee_{n \ kq} V(q) \bigvee_{nk \ 3 \ nk+q} :$$
(11)

Since  $n_k$  and  $n_k$  are independent variables, the global transform ation

$$_{nk} ! e^{i_{2}} _{nk}; \quad _{nk} ! \quad _{nk} e^{i_{2}}; \qquad (12)$$

becomes allowed within the path-integral and is indeed a symmetry transformation of the full action  $S = S_0 + S_{imp}$  when  $!_n = 0.A$  nite frequency,  $!_n \in 0$ , spoils this symmetry. If, in addition, the disorder is long range, namely it does not induce internode scatterings, it is possible to de ne four independent symmetry transformations of the above kind, one for each node. This type of chiral symmetry plays a crucial role for long range disorder, as was rst emphasized in Ref. [9].

We notice that the disorder does not induce any mixing between dimensional 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 information about

the quasiparticle density of states  $(D \circ S)$  at given frequency as well as about transport  $\infty e$  cients.

In order to derive a long-wavelength e ective action, we resort to the replica-trick technique, hence we rst introduce N replicas of the G rassm an variables,  $\overline{q}$  ( i!) !  $\overline{q}_{k}$  ( i!) and  $q_{k}$  ( i!) !  $q_{k}$  ( i!), with a = 1;:::;N. At the end we shall send N ! 0. Next we de ne the column vectors q and  $\overline{q}_{k}$ , with 4N elements (N replicas, 2 spins and 2 frequencies)  $c_{ak}$  ( i!) and  $\overline{q}_{k}$  ( i!), respectively. Finally we introduce new Nambu spinors through<sup>3</sup>

$$_{k} = \frac{1}{\overline{2}} \stackrel{0}{=} \frac{\overline{c}_{k}}{i_{2}c_{k}} A;$$

as well as

$$k = k c^{t}$$

with the charge conjugacy operator de ned by  $\frac{3}{2}$ 

c= i 2 1:

Here the Pauli matrices  $_1$ ,  $_2$  and  $_3$  act on the spin components of the column vectors  $q_k$  and  $\bar{q}_k$ , while  $_1$ ,  $_2$  and  $_3$  act on the Nambu components (the diagonal elements refer to the particle-hole channels and the o -diagonal ones to the particle-particle channels). For later convenience, we also introduce the Pauli matrices  $s_1$ ,  $s_2$  and  $s_3$ , which act on the opposite frequency partners, as well as the identity matrices in the spin, Nambu and frequency subspaces,  $_0$ ,  $_0$  and  $s_0$ , respectively.

By means of the above de nitions, the clean action can be written as

$$S_{0} = \sum_{k}^{K} \sum_{k = k} [k + i_{k 2} S_{1} \quad i! S_{3}]_{k} :$$
(13)

Since we are interested in the low-energy long-wavelength behavior, we shall focus our attention only in small 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 small momentum deviations away from the nodal points, we introduce new G rassmann variables de ned around each node through

$$C_{a}$$
;  $\mathcal{R}_{a^+}$ ;  $\overline{C}_{a}$ ;  $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{a^+}$ ;

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

One notices that for a = 1;2

$$\begin{array}{c} - & = & \frac{1}{p-2} (e_{a;}; i_{g;2}) = & \frac{t}{a} & c^{t}; \\ - & = & \frac{1}{p-2} (e_{a;}; i_{g;2}) = & \frac{t}{a} & c^{t}: \end{array}$$

The non-disordered action expanded around the nodes reads

$$S_{0} = \begin{bmatrix} X & & \\ & 1 & [v_{F} + iv & 2S_{1}] & 1 & -1 & [v_{F} + iv & 2S_{1}] & 1_{k} \\ & + \begin{bmatrix} & & & \\ & 2 & [v_{F} + iv & 2S_{1}] & 2 & -2 & [v_{F} + iv & 2S_{1}] & -2_{k} \\ & & X & & \\ & & i! & & i & s_{3 - 1} & i \\ & & & i = 1; \overline{1}; 2; \overline{2} \end{bmatrix}$$

We nd useful to de ne new spinors with components in each of the nodes through

$$\begin{array}{cccccc}
0 & 1 \\
 & & 1 \\
 & & C \\$$

so that

$$= \frac{t}{1}; \frac{t}{2}; \frac{t}{1}; \frac{t}{2}; c^{t} = t_{1}c^{t};$$

where the Paulim atrices 's act on the m and  $\overline{m}$  subspace, namely connect two opposite nodes. This naturally leads to a new charge conjugacy de ned through

$$C = c_1 = i_{2,1,1}$$
 (15)

In what follows we denote as pair 1 the two opposite nodes 1" and  $\overline{1}"$ , and as pair 2 the other two nodes, 2" and  $\overline{2}"$ . Consequently we need to introduce also matrices in the two-pair subspace, 1 and 2, namely connecting adjacent nodes, which we will denote as  $_0$ , the identity,  $_1$ ,  $_2$  and  $_3$ , the three Paulim atrices.

The clean action reads now

$$S_{0} = \begin{array}{c} X & - & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & + & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & X & - \\ & & & \\ &$$

W e notice that within this path-integral form ulation, the four independent chiral symmetry transform ations of the form (12) translate into

with T given by any of the following expressions

$$T = e^{i_{2} s_{1} 0 0} "; (18)$$

$$T = e^{i_{2} s_{1} s_{0}}; (19)$$

$$T = e^{i_{2} s_{1} 0 3} i'; (20)$$

$$T = e^{i_{2} s_{1} s_{3}}; (21)$$

where is a phase factor and u an arbitrary unit vector.

We assume that the scattering potential V (q) = V (q) induced by disorder has independent components which act inside each node, V (q)  $U_0(q)$ , between opposite nodes, V (q + 2k<sub>1</sub>)  $U_1(q)$  and V (q + 2k<sub>2</sub>)  $U_2(q)$ , and between adjacent nodes, V (q + k<sub>1</sub> k<sub>2</sub>)  $U_{12}(q)$  and V (q + k<sub>1</sub> + k<sub>2</sub>)  $U_{1\overline{2}}(q)$ , so that the inpurity contribution to the action is

$$S_{im p} = \begin{array}{c} X \\ & & & \\$$

A part from the st term in the right hand side of 22), we have for convenience kept the node labels. Since the following relations hold:

we can rewrite (22) in the following way:

$$S_{im p} = \begin{array}{c} X \\ U_{0}(q) \\ + \\ + \\ U_{1}(q) \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ + \\ U_{2}(q) \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ + \\ 2 \\ U_{2}(q) \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ + \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ U_{12}(q) \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ + \\ 2 \\ U_{12}(q) \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ + \\ 1 \\ U_{12}(q) \\ 1 \\ U_{12}(q) \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ U_{12}(q) \\ 1 \\$$

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

$$S_{0} = \begin{bmatrix} Z & & \\ dr & (r) \frac{1}{2} & _{3} & (iQ & iQ) & [v_{F} + iv & _{2}s_{1}] & (r) \\ Z & & \\ + & dr & (r) \frac{1}{2} & _{3} & _{3} & (iQ + iQ) & [v_{F} & iv & _{2}s_{1}] & (r) \\ Z & & & Z \\ & & & I! & dr & (r) s_{3} & (r) & dr & (r) & [H_{0}(r) & i! s_{3}] & (r); & (24) \end{bmatrix}$$

and the impurity term

$$S_{im p} = \frac{Z}{dr U_{0}(r) (r) (r)} (r)$$

$$+ U_{1}(r) _{1}(r) _{1}(r) + U_{1}(r) _{1}(r) _{1}(r)$$

$$+ U_{2}(r) _{2}(r) _{2}(r) + U_{2}(r) _{2}(r) _{2}(r)$$

$$+ 2U_{12}(r) _{1}(r) _{2}(r) + 2U_{12}(r) _{2}(r) _{1}(r)$$

$$+ 2U_{1\overline{2}}(r) _{1}(r) _{2}(r) + 2U_{1\overline{2}}(r) _{\overline{2}}(r) _{1}(r): (25)$$

Paulim atrices	subspace of action
0 <b>;</b> 1 <b>;</b> 2 <b>;</b> 3	spin com ponents
0 <b>;</b> 1 <b>;</b> 2 <b>;</b> 3	N am bu com ponents
s <sub>0</sub> ;s <sub>1</sub> ;s <sub>2</sub> ;s <sub>3</sub>	opposite frequency partners
0 <b>;</b> 1 <b>;</b> 2 <b>;</b> 3	opposite nodal points
0; 1; 2; 3	the two pairs of opposite nodes

TABLE I: The various two-components subspaces in which each set of Paulim atrices act

W e further assume that the disorder is -like correlated with

$$\begin{aligned} hU_{0}(\mathbf{r})\mathbf{i} &= 0; \quad hU_{0}(\mathbf{r})U_{0}(\mathbf{r}^{0})\mathbf{i} &= u^{2} \quad (\mathbf{r} \quad \mathbf{f}); \\ hU_{1}(\mathbf{r})\mathbf{i} &= 0; \quad hU_{1}(\mathbf{r})U_{1}(\mathbf{r}^{0}) \quad \mathbf{i} &= 2v^{2} \quad (\mathbf{r} \quad \mathbf{f}); \\ hU_{2}(\mathbf{r})\mathbf{i} &= 0; \quad hU_{2}(\mathbf{r})U_{2}(\mathbf{r}^{0}) \quad \mathbf{i} &= 2v^{2} \quad (\mathbf{r} \quad \mathbf{f}); \\ hU_{12}(\mathbf{r})\mathbf{i} &= 0; \quad hU_{12}(\mathbf{r})U_{12}(\mathbf{r}^{0}) \quad \mathbf{i} &= 2w^{2} \quad (\mathbf{r} \quad \mathbf{f}); \\ hU_{1\overline{2}}(\mathbf{r})\mathbf{i} &= 0; \quad hU_{1\overline{2}}(\mathbf{r})U_{1\overline{2}}(\mathbf{r}^{0}) \quad \mathbf{i} &= 2w^{2} \quad (\mathbf{r} \quad \mathbf{f}); \\ hU_{1\overline{2}}(\mathbf{r})\mathbf{i} &= 0; \quad hU_{1\overline{2}}(\mathbf{r})U_{1\overline{2}}(\mathbf{r}^{0}) \quad \mathbf{i} &= 2w^{2} \quad (\mathbf{r} \quad \mathbf{f}): \end{aligned}$$

We conclude by noticing that (i) if only  $u \notin 0$  all transform ations (18){(21) leave the action invariant; (ii) if  $u \notin 0$  and  $v \notin 0$  only (18) and (20) are allowed; (iii) nally if  $u \notin 0$ ,  $v \notin 0$  and  $w \notin 0$  only (18) remains.

# IV. SYMMETRY PROPERTIES

Since we have been obliged to introduce so m any Paulim atrices, including the identity denoted as the zeroth Paulim atrix, for sake of clarity we prefer to start this Section by rst summarizing in Table I the subspaces in which any of them act.

Now, let us uncover all global symmetry transformations. We start assuming that only intra-node disorder is present, namely  $U_0 \in 0$  but  $U_1 = U_2 = U_{12} = U_{1\overline{2}} = 0$ .

If the frequency is zero, the action  $S_0 + S_{imp}$  is invariant under unitary global transfor-

mations T such that

$$C^{t}T^{t}C_{3}T = 3;$$

$$C^{t}T^{t}C_{3} {}_{2}s_{1}T = 3 {}_{2}s_{1};$$

$$C^{t}T^{t}C_{3} {}_{3}T = 3 {}_{3};$$

$$C^{t}T^{t}C_{3} {}_{3} {}_{2}s_{1}T = 3 {}_{3} {}_{2}s_{1};$$

$$C^{t}T^{t}C {}_{3} {}_{3} {}_{2}s_{1}T = 3 {}_{3} {}_{2}s_{1};$$

They im ply that

$$C^{t}T^{t}C = T^{-1};$$
(27)

as well as that

$$[\mathbf{T};_{3}] = 0; \ [\mathbf{T};_{3}] = 0; \ [\mathbf{T};_{2}s_{1}] = 0:$$
(28)

We parametrize T as

$$T = \frac{1}{2} (T_1 + T_2) _0 + \frac{1}{2} (T_1 - T_2) _3; \qquad (29)$$

where the su x  $1^{\text{m}}$  refers to the pair 1 (opposite nodes 1 and  $\overline{1}$ ) and  $2^{\text{m}}$  to the pair 2 (opposite nodes 2 and  $\overline{2}$ ). The symmetry modes for pair 1 and 2 can be parametrized by the 16N 16N unitary operators

$$T_{1(2)} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 + 0 \\ 0 + 0 \end{pmatrix} V_{1(2)} + \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} V_{\overline{1}(\overline{2})} \qquad \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ V_{1(2)} & 0 \\ 0 & V_{\overline{1}(\overline{2})} \end{pmatrix} A ;$$

where the V's are 8N 8N unitary matrices. Because of 27) we get

$$C^{t}T_{1(2)}^{t}C = T_{1(2)}^{1} = T_{1(2)}^{y}$$
;

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

$$c^{t}V_{1(2)}^{t}c = V_{\overline{1(2)}}^{Y}$$
: (30)

T herefore

is indeed parametrized by a single 8N 8N unitary matrix  $V_{1(2)}$ . Since the two pairs of nodes behave similarly, in what follows we drop the su ces 1 and 2. According to (28) we still need to impose that

$$[V; _{2} s_{1}] = 0:$$
 (31)

To this purpose let us introduce the following unitary operation

$$U = \frac{1}{2} (_{0} + _{2}) \frac{1}{2} (_{0} _{2}) s_{3} e^{\frac{i_{4}}{4}s_{2}}:$$
(32)

which transform s

! U ; ! 'U'c' = 'c'U' = 
$$U^{Y}$$
;

so that for any operator O

One readily shows that

$$U^{Y}_{2} s_{1} U = s_{3}; U^{Y} s_{3} U = s_{3};$$
 (33)

hence (31) transform s into

$$[V;s_3] = 0;$$
 (34)

which is ful lled by the general expression

$$V = \frac{1}{2} (A + B) s_0 + \frac{1}{2} (A - B) s_i;$$
(35)

with A and B being independent 4N 4N unitary matrices. Therefore the original symmetry turns out to be U(4N) U(4N) for pair 1, and analogously for pair 2, in total U(4N) U(4N) U(4N) U(4N) U(4N) U(4N).

We notice that, in the presence of a nite frequency,  $! \in 0$ , we shall further impose through (33) that

 $[V; s_1] = 0;$ 

which is satis ed by

$$V = C s_0;$$

with C belonging to U (4N). Therefore the symmetry is lowered by the frequency down to U (4N) for the pair 1 times U (4N) for the pair 2.

W ithin the non-linear -m odel approach to disordered systems, the frequency plays actually the role of a symmetry-breaking eld. This leads to the identication of the transverse modes V<sup>?</sup> as those satisfying

$$s_1 V^? s_1 = V^? = V^? Y$$

in plying  $A = B^{y}$  in Eq.(35) so that we can write

$$V^{?} = \frac{1}{2}^{h} p \frac{1}{G} + \frac{p \frac{1}{G^{y}}}{G^{y}} s_{0} + \frac{1}{2}^{h} \frac{p \frac{1}{G^{y}}}{G} \frac{p \frac{1}{G^{y}}}{G^{y}} s_{3}; \qquad (36)$$

where G belongs to U (4N). In other words the coset space spanned by the transverse m odes is still a group, namely U (4N). It is convenient to factorize out of G the abelian component. For that we write

$$G = e^{i \frac{p}{N}} g; \qquad (37)$$

where is a scalar and g belongs to SU (4N). The form s (36) and (37) will be useful in the following to express the non-linear -m odel directly in terms of g and . After the transformation (32) from Eq.(30) we not that

$$V_{\overline{1}(\overline{2})}^{?} = {\begin{array}{*{20}c} h & i_{t} \\ 1 & 2 & V_{1(2)}^{?} & 1 & 2 \end{array}} = {\begin{array}{*{20}c} 1 & 2 & s_{1} V_{1(2)}^{?} & s_{1} & 1 & 2 \end{array}}^{t};$$
(38)

which leads to

$$\overline{1}_{1(\overline{2})} = 1_{1(2)}; \ g_{\overline{1}}_{\overline{(2)}} = 1_{2} \ g_{1(2)}^{y} = 2_{1}:$$
 (39)

Let us conclude by showing what would change form ore general disorder potential. First let us consider the case in which the disorder also contains terms which couple opposite nodes, i.e.  $U_1 \notin 0$  and  $U_2 \notin 0$ . In this case the <sub>3</sub>-m odes are not anym ore allowed by symmetry, so we have to impose that  $V_{1(2)} = V_{\overline{1(2)}}$ , namely, through (39), that <sub>1(2)</sub> = 0 and

$$g_{1(2)}^{y} = g_{1(2)}^{1} = {}_{1 2} g_{1(2)}^{t} {}_{2 1}$$
 (40)

The coset becomes now the group Sp(2N) of unitary-symplectic matrices (also called USp(4N)) for pair 1 and analogously for pair 2, i.e. Sp(2N) Sp(2N).

Finally, if also scattering between adjacent nodes is allowed,  $U_{12} \notin 0$  and  $U_{1\overline{2}} \notin 0$ , then also the <sub>3</sub> modes do not leave the action invariant. In this case we have to impose that  $V_1^2 = V_2^2$ , so that the coset space is the group Sp (2N).

# V. THE NON-LINEAR -MODEL

In what follows we begin analyzing just the case in which the disorder only induces intranode scattering processes. At the end we will return back to the most general case. Within the replica trick, we can average the action over the disorder probability distribution, after which (25) with v = w = 0 [see Eq. (26)] transform s into

$$S_{imp} = \frac{u^2}{2} dr (r) (r)^2$$
: (41)

We de ne 32N 32N matrices X (r) by

so that (41) can be also written as

$$S_{imp} = \frac{u^2}{2} \frac{Z}{dr Tr(X(r)X(r))}$$
 (42)

By means of an Hubbard-Stratonovich transform ation one can show that

$$\exp \frac{u^{2}}{2} \operatorname{dr} \operatorname{Tr} (X (r) X (r)) = DQ (r) \exp \operatorname{dr} \frac{1}{2u^{2}} \operatorname{Tr} Q (r)^{2} \operatorname{iTr} [Q (r) X (r)];$$
(43)

with Q (r) being herm it ian 32N 32N auxiliary matrix elds.

In conclusion the full action, (24) plus (43), becomes

$$S = \frac{1}{2u_{Z}^{2}} dr Tr Q (r)^{2} + dr (r) [H_{0}(r) iQ (r) i! s] (r):$$
(44)

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

$$S[Q] = \frac{1}{2u^2}^Z dr Tr Q(r)^2 = \frac{1}{2} Tr \ln [iQ + i! s_3 H_0]:$$
 (45)

We further proceed in the derivation of a long-wavelength e ective action for Q (r) by following the conventional approach. First of all we calculate the saddle point expression of Q (r), which we denote by  $Q_0 s_3$ , assuming it is uniform, in the presence of an in nitesimal symmetry breaking term  $! s_3$ . Then we neglect longitudinal uctuations and parametrize the actual Q (r) by

$$Q(\mathbf{r})' T(\mathbf{r})^{-1} Q_0 s_3 T(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{2} (_0 + _3) Q_1(\mathbf{r}) + \frac{1}{2} (_0 _{-3}) Q_2(\mathbf{r});$$
 (46)

where through (29)  $Q_{ab}(r) = {}_{ab}Q_{a}(r)$  with

$$Q_{a}(\mathbf{r}) = T_{a}(\mathbf{r})^{-1} Q_{0} s_{3} T_{a}(\mathbf{r}) = Q_{0} s_{3} T_{a}(\mathbf{r})^{2} = T_{a}(\mathbf{r})^{-2} Q_{0} s_{3};$$
(47)

being the auxiliary eld in the pair subspace a;b=1;2. Notice that, even though the most general Q (r) would couple the nodes together, namely would include o -diagonal elements  $Q_{12}$  (r), (46) does not contain any mixing term. This simply rejects that the o -diagonal components are not di usive, hence massive.

In order to derive the long-wavelength action we nd it convenient to decompose the action into the real part

$$S_{NLM} = \frac{1}{2u^{2}} \overset{Z}{dr} TrQ(r)^{2}$$
  
$$\frac{1}{4} Tr\ln [iQ + i! s_{3} H_{0}] \frac{1}{4} Tr\ln iQ i! s_{3} H_{0}^{Y}; \quad (48)$$

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

$$S = \frac{1}{4} \operatorname{Tr} \ln [iQ + i! s_3 H_0] + \frac{1}{4} \operatorname{Tr} \ln iQ i! s H_0^{y}; \quad (49)$$

which we will show gives rise to a W ZW term .

## VI. CONVENTIONAL -MODEL

By means of (46), the real part of the action, (48), can be written as

$$S_{NLM} = \frac{V_e}{2u^2} 32N Q_0^2 - \frac{1}{4} Tr \ln G^1$$
; (50)

where  $V_{eff}$  is the e ective volume corresponding to the long-wavelength theory (roughly speaking  $V_{eff} = V=4$ , since we have implicitly folded the Brillouin zone into a single quadrant, in order to make all nodes coincide), and

$$G^{1} = H_{0}H_{0}^{Y} + Q_{0}^{2} + !^{2} + ! (Q s_{3} + s_{3}Q) + iH_{0}Q \quad iQ H_{0}^{Y}$$

$$G_{0}^{1} ; \qquad (51)$$

where

$$G_0^{1} = H_0 H_0^{y} + Q_0^{2} + !^{2};$$
  
= ! fQ; sg  $iH_0 Q + iQ H_0^{y}:$ 

W e notice that  $s_3 H_0 s_3 = H_0^{Y}$ ; therefore

 $iH_0Q$   $iQH_0^{Y} = iH_0Qs_3s_3$   $iQs_3H_0s_3 = i[H_0;Qs_3]s_3 = J$  rQ;

where we made use of the equivalence Q s<sub>3</sub>  $T^2$  and of the expression of the spin current operator in the long wave-length lim it

$$J(r) = i [H_0(r); r]:$$
 (52)

A nalogously one can show that

$$\begin{array}{cccc} & & & & & & & \\ \text{iH}_{0} Q & & \text{iQ} H_{0}^{\text{Y}} = & \text{is}_{3} H_{0}^{\text{Y}} \text{s}_{3} Q & & \text{is}_{3} \text{s}_{3} Q H_{0}^{\text{Y}} = & & \text{is}_{3} \text{s}_{3} Q \text{;} H_{0}^{\text{Y}} = \text{r} Q & & & & & & & \\ \end{array}$$

so that the self-energy operator can be written as

$$= ! fQ; sg J rQ = ! fQ_3gs rQ yJ$$
(53)

We then expand the action up to second order in and obtain

$$S_{NLM} = \frac{V_{e}}{2u^{2}} 32N Q_{0}^{2} + \frac{1}{4} Tr \ln G^{-1}$$

$$= \frac{V_{e}}{2u^{2}} 32N Q_{0}^{2} + \frac{1}{4} Tr \ln [G_{0}] + \frac{1}{4} Tr \ln [I - G_{0}]$$

$$= \frac{V_{e}}{2u^{2}} 32N Q_{0}^{2} + \frac{1}{4} Tr \ln [G_{0}] + \frac{1}{4} Tr [G_{0}] + \frac{1}{8} Tr [G_{0} - G_{0}]$$

$$= \frac{V_{e}}{2u^{2}} 32N Q_{0}^{2} + \frac{1}{4} Tr \ln [G_{0}] + \frac{1}{2} Tr [Q - S_{3} - G_{0}]$$

$$+ \frac{!^{2}}{8} Tr [G_{0} fQ ; s_{3}g G_{0} fQ ; s_{3}g] + \frac{1}{8} Tr [G_{0} r Q - U_{0}] = (54)$$

Notice that we have arrived to  $S_{N L M}$  in terms of  $\hat{r} Q$  without passing through a gauge transform ation to carry out the gradient expansion so avoiding any problem related to a proper treatment of the Jacobian determinant<sup>20</sup>.

# A. Saddle point equation

In momentum space one nds that

$$H_{0} H_{0}^{Y} = \frac{1}{2} + 2 + 2 + 2 + 3 \frac{1}{2} +$$

where  $E_1$  is the spectrum of quasiparticles around nodes  $1^{"}$  and  $\overline{1}^{"}$ , and analogously for  $E_2$ , see (5) and (6). Therefore

$$G_0 = \frac{1}{2} [G_1 + G_2] + \frac{1}{2} [G_1 - G_2];$$

where

$$G_1 = \frac{1}{E_1^2 + Q_0^2 + !^2}; \qquad G_2 = \frac{1}{E_2^2 + Q_0^2 + !^2};$$

so that

$$G_0^2 = \frac{1}{2} G_1^2 + G_2^2 + {}_3 \frac{1}{2} G_1^2 - G_2^2$$
 (55)

The saddle-point equation is obtained by taking  $Q(\mathbf{r}) = Q_0$  and m in imizing the action, which leads to the self-consistency equation

$$\frac{Q_0}{Q_0 + !} = u^2 \frac{1}{V} \frac{X}{k} \frac{1}{E_k^2 + (Q_0 + !)^2};$$
(56)

originally derived in Ref. [1]. The solution of this equation, in the limit !! 0, reads

$$Q_0 = \exp - \frac{v_F v}{2u^2}$$
;

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 '. We notice that in the generic case with nite inter-nodal scattering, namely with non zero  $\sqrt[7]{}$  and  $w^2$ , the saddle point equation remains the same apart form  $u^2$  !  $u^2 + 2w^2 + v^2$ .

The quasiparticle density of states N ( ), after the analytic continuation of i! to the positive real axis, i! > 0, turns out to be, for small ,

N () = 
$$\frac{2}{{}^{2}v_{F}v} \frac{4}{2}Q_{0} \ln \frac{q}{{}^{2}+Q_{0}^{2}} + \frac{2}{2} \frac{3}{2} \tan^{1}\frac{Q_{0}^{2}}{2} \frac{2}{Q_{0}} 5$$
: (57)

Therefore the density of states at the saddle-point acquires a nite value  $N_0 = Q_0 = u^2$  at the chem ical potential = 0, while, for  $Q_0$ , turns back to the linear dependence N () as in the absence of disorder.

# B. Frequency dependent term s

The storder term in the frequency is just

$$\frac{!}{2} \operatorname{Tr}[Q \ s_{3} G_{0}] = \frac{!}{2} \frac{N_{0}}{Q_{0}} \operatorname{drTr}[Q \ (r) \ s_{3}]:$$
(58)

The second order term is readily found to be

$$\frac{!^{2}}{8} \operatorname{Tr}[G_{0} \text{ fQ}; s_{3}\text{g} G_{0} \text{ fQ}; s_{3}\text{g}] = \frac{1}{32^{-2}} \frac{!^{2}}{v_{F} v} \frac{1}{Q_{0}^{2}}^{Z} \operatorname{drTr} fQ \text{ (r)}; s_{3}\text{g}^{2} : \qquad (59)$$

This term is negligible as compared to (58) for frequencies ! much smaller than  $v_F v N_0$ . The latter is therefore the energy scale below which di usion sets in at the mean eld level, namely the so-called inverse relaxation time in the Born approximation, 1 = 0.

C. G radient expansion

The Fourier transform of the current operator is

$$J(q) = {}_{3}\frac{1}{2}[J_{1}(q) + J_{2}(q)] + {}_{3}{}_{3}\frac{1}{2}[J_{1}(q) - J_{2}(q)];$$
(60)

where, at long wavelengths q ! 0,

$$J_1(q) ! J_1 = (v_F ; iv_2 s_1)$$
  
 $J_2(q) ! J_2 = (iv_2 s_1 ; v_F):$ 

It is then easy to derive the following expression of the tensor product  $J = J^{y}$ 

$$J \quad J^{Y} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ J & J^{Y} & J & J^{Y} \\ J & J^{Y} & J & J^{Y} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ & & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ & & & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ & & & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ & & & & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ & & & & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ & & & & & 1 & 0 \\ & & & & & & 1 & 0 \\ & & & & & & 1 & 0 \\ & & & & & & 1 & 0 \\ & & & & & & & 1 & 0 \\ & & & & & & & 1 & 0 \\ & & & & & & & 1 & 0 \\ & & & & & & & & 1 & 0 \\ & & & & & & & & 1 & 0 \\ & & & & & & & & & 1 & 0 \\ & & & & & & & & & 1 & 0 \\ & & & & & & & & & 1 & 0 \\ & & & & & & & & & & 1 & 0 \\ & & & & & & & & & & 1 & 0 \\ & & & & & & & & & & 1 & 0 \\ & & & & & & & & & & & 1 & 0 \\ & & & & & & & & & & & & 1 & 0 \\ & & & & & & & & & & & & 1 & 0 \\ & & & & & & & & & & & & 1 & 0 \\ \end{array}$$

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

$$\frac{1}{8} \operatorname{Tr} G_{0} \tilde{r} Q \qquad \overset{i}{\Im} G_{0} J \qquad \overset{i}{r} Q = \frac{1}{8} \operatorname{Tr} \theta_{i} Q \quad \theta_{j} Q \quad G_{0} J_{j}^{Y} G_{0} J_{i}$$
$$= \frac{1}{16} \operatorname{Tr} \theta_{i} Q \quad \theta_{j} Q \quad G_{0} J_{j}^{Y} G_{0} J_{i} + G_{0} J_{i}^{Y} G_{0} J_{j}$$

In the long wavelength lim it

since  $P = G_1^2 = G_2^2 = 0.We$  nd that

$$\frac{1}{4V} X G_1^2 + G_2^2 = \frac{1}{2V} G_1^2$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \frac{Z}{4} \frac{d}{4} \frac{d}{2} - \frac{1}{v_F^2} \frac{1}{2 + v^2} \frac{1}{2 + Q_0^2}$$

$$= \frac{1}{8} \frac{Z}{v_F v} \frac{1}{v_0} dx^2 - \frac{1}{x^2 + Q_0^2} = \frac{1}{8} \frac{1}{v_F v} \frac{1}{Q_0^2}$$

The D rude spin-conductivity is de ned by

$$= \frac{1}{4^{-2}} \frac{v_{\rm F}^2 + v^2}{v_{\rm F} v}; \qquad (62)$$

so that the second order gradient correction can be written as

$$\frac{Z}{16Q_0^2} \quad dr Tr[rQ(r) rQ(r)] + \frac{v_F^2 - v_F^2}{v_F^2 + v^2} Trf_3 [QQ(r)QQ(r) QQ(r)] Q(r)] g:$$

D. The nalform of  $S_{\rm N\ L\ M}$ 

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

$$S_{NLM} = \frac{1}{16Q_{0}^{2}} dr Tr[rQ(r) rQ(r)] + \frac{1}{16Q_{0}^{2}} dr \frac{v_{F}^{2}}{v_{F}^{2} + v^{2}} Trf_{3} [Q(r)Q(r) Q(r)] Q(r) Q(r)] + \frac{1}{16Q_{0}^{2}} dr TrQ(r) s_{3}] = \frac{X}{\frac{1}{16Q_{0}^{2}}} dr TrQ(r) s_{3}] = \frac{X}{\frac{1}{16Q_{0}^{2}}} TrQQ_{1}(r) (i)QQ_{1}(r) \frac{1}{2Q_{0}} TrQ_{1}(r) s_{3}]; (63)$$

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

$$(1) = \frac{2}{v_F^2 + v^2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ v_F^2 & 0 \\ 0 & v^2 \end{pmatrix} ;$$

and for the pair 2, i.e. for nodes  $\2"$  and  $\2"$ ,

$${}^{(2)} = \frac{2}{v_F^2 + v^2} \begin{array}{ccc} 0 & 1 \\ v^2 & 0 \\ 0 & v_F^2 \end{array} ;$$

In reality the above action is not the most general one allowed by symmetry. As we discussed earlier, the theory possesses two chiral abelian sectors, which actually occur in the singlet channels  $_{3}$   $_{2}$   $s_{1}$   $_{0}$  and  $_{3}$   $_{2}$   $s_{1}$   $_{3}$ , see (19) and (21). In analogy with Ref. [24], we expect that upon integrating out longitudinal uctuations the following term would appear:

with /  $u^2$ .

In conclusion the most general non-linear model is given by

$$S_{NLM} = \frac{X}{\sum_{i=1,2}^{i=1,2}} dr \frac{Z}{16Q_{0}^{2}} Tr (Q_{i}(r))^{(i)} (Q_{i}(r)) \frac{N_{0}}{2Q_{0}} Tr (Q_{i}(r) s_{3}) + \frac{Tr(3 2 s_{1} Q_{i}(r)) (Q_{i}(r))^{(i)} Tr(3 2 s_{1} Q_{i}(r)) (Q_{i}(r))^{(i)}}{16^{2} Q_{0}^{4}} Tr(3 2 s_{1} Q_{i}(r)) (Q_{i}(r))^{(i)} Tr(3 2 s_{1} Q_{i}(r)) (Q_{i}(r))^{(i)} (Q_{i}(r))^{(i)} Tr(3 2 s_{1} Q_{i}(r)) (Q_{i}(r))^{(i)} (Q_{i}(r))^{(i)$$

VII. FAILURE OF THE CONVENTIONAL -MODEL

The non-linear -m odel (65) belongs to one of the known chiral -m odels encountered when two-sublattice symmetry holds, see Refs. [9,24,25]. If we simply 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 limit, N ! 0. That would imply absence of localization and persistence of di usive m odes. M oreover we should predict a quasiparticle density of states N () which diverges like<sup>26,27,28</sup>

" r \_\_\_\_#  
N()' 
$$\frac{1}{exp}$$
 A<sup>3</sup> ln  $\frac{B}{exp}$ ; (66)

with 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 tempted to correlate the above suspicious result with what is found for the elementary loops of the W ilson-Polyakov renorm alization group approach. Here one integrates out iteratively degrees of freedom in a momentum shell from the highest cut-o to =s, with s > 0 eventually sent to in nity. In our case these fundamental loops for either nodes are given by Z

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

and provide the de nition of the dimensionless coupling constant g, which should necessarily be small to justify a loop-expansion in g ln s 1. In our case it turns out that g = 1, making any loop expansion meaningless.

This results is at odds with the standard non linear -m odels for disordered systems where g 1= 1 for weak disorder. Here, whatever weak is the disorder, yet g = 1. This peculiar fact was originally discussed in Ref. [19], where the authors identi ed correctly the complete failure of the non-crossing approximation as a starting point of perturbation theory due to the absence of small control parameters. This might 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 assumption that quantum uctuations around the saddle-point solution can be controlled perturbatively.

In the following 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 -m odel action.

# VIII. W ESS-ZUM INO-NOVIKOV-W ITTEN TERM

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

$$S = \frac{1}{4} \operatorname{Tr} \ln [iQ \quad H_0] + \frac{1}{4} \operatorname{Tr} \ln^{h} iQ \quad H_0^{V} :$$
 (67)

It is more convenient to evaluate the variation of S along a massless path de ned through

$$Q(r)Q(r) + Q(r) = 0$$
: (68)

We nd that

$$S = \frac{i}{4} Tr[G Q] + \frac{i}{4} Tr G^{Y} Q ;$$
 (69)

where

$$G = (iQ H_0)^{-1}$$
: (70)

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

iQ  $H_0^Y$  (iQ  $H_0$ ) '  $G_0^{1}$  r Q  $J = {}_0 G^1$  J<sup>Y</sup> r Q; (71)

and

$$(iQ H_0) \quad iQ H_0^{Y} ' G_0^{1} + rQ \quad J = G^{1} + J^{Y} rQ;$$
(72)

hence

$$G = \begin{bmatrix} I & G_{0} r Q & J^{\frac{1}{2}} G_{0} & iQ & H_{0}^{V} \\ & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & \\$$

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

$$G G^{Y}' 2iG_{0}rQ J_{G}rQ J_{G}Q:$$
(73)

T herefore

$$S = \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Tr} [Q G_0 r Q \quad J G r Q \quad J G Q ]$$
  
=  $\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Tr} Q G_0 r Q \quad J G J^{\Upsilon} \quad r Q G Q$ (74)

The only term which contributes comes from the anti-symmetric component of the tensor  $J = J^{y}$ :

$$\frac{1}{2} J_{i} J_{j}^{y} J_{j} J_{i}^{y} = i_{ij} v_{F} v_{2} s_{1} {}_{3};$$
(75)

being ij the Levi-C ivita tensor, thus leading to

$$S = i \qquad \underset{\substack{i;j \\ i;j}}{X} Tr [@_j Q Q Q @_i Q _2 S_{1 _3}]$$
(76)

where

$$= \frac{1}{4V} X V_{F} V G_{1}^{3} + G_{2}^{3}$$
$$= \frac{1}{8} \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} dx^{2} \frac{1}{x^{2} + Q_{0}^{2}}^{3} = \frac{1}{16} \frac{1}{Q_{0}^{4}};$$
(77)

Introducing a ctitious coordinate which parametrizes the massless path, we nally get

$$S = i \frac{1}{12} \frac{1}{4Q_{0}^{6}} Z^{2} d^{3}r \qquad Tr[_{2}s_{1} _{3}Q(r)@Q(r)Q(r)@Q(r)Q(r)@Q(r)Q(r)@Q(r)]$$
(78)  
=  $i \frac{1}{12} \frac{1}{4Q_{0}^{6}} d^{3}r \qquad Tr[_{2}s_{1}Q_{1}(r)@Q_{1}(r)Q_{1}(r)@Q_{1}(r)Q_{1}(r)Q_{1}(r)@Q_{1}(r)]$   
=  $i \frac{1}{12} \frac{1}{4Q_{0}^{6}} d^{3}r \qquad Tr[_{2}s_{1}Q_{2}(r)@Q_{2}(r)Q_{2}(r)Q_{2}(r)Q_{2}(r)Q_{2}(r)Q_{2}(r)Q_{2}(r)]$ :

This actually represents opposite W ZW terms for each of the two pairs of nodes, namely for each of the two independent U (1) SU (4N) -m odels. It is clear that if the disorder coupled the two pairs of nodes, we would be forced to identify  $Q_1(r)$  with  $Q_2(r)$ , so that the W ZW term would cancel in that case. To make (78) more explicit we remind that, for a = 1;2,

$$Q_{a}(\mathbf{r}) = T_{a}(\mathbf{r})^{2} s_{3} Q_{0} = s_{3} Q_{0} T_{a}(\mathbf{r})^{2};$$
 (79)

where

$$\Gamma_{a}^{2}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{2} \left( {}_{0} + {}_{3} \right) V_{a}^{2}(\mathbf{r}) + \frac{1}{2} \left( {}_{0} {}_{3} \right) c^{t} V_{a}^{2}(\mathbf{r})^{t} c; \qquad (80)$$

and

$$V_{a}^{2}(\mathbf{r}) = U \quad \frac{1}{2} (s_{0} + s_{3}) e^{i \frac{p}{N}} g_{a}(\mathbf{r}) + \frac{1}{2} (s_{0} g_{a}(\mathbf{r}) + \frac{1}{2} (s_{0} g_{a}(\mathbf{r})) e^{i \frac{p}{N}} g_{a}(\mathbf{r}) g_{a}(\mathbf{r})$$
(81)

U being de ned in Eq. (32). By means of (79), (80) and (81), the expression (78) can be nally written as

$$S = i \frac{1}{12} \int_{Z}^{Z} d^{3}r \qquad Tr g_{1} (r)^{y} (g_{1} (r) g_{1} (r))^{y} (g_{1} (r) g_{1} (r))^{y} (g_{1} (r) g_{1} (r))^{y} (g_{1} (r))^{y} (g_{1} (r) g_{1} (r))^{y} (g_{2} (r) g_{1} (r))^{y} (g_{2} (r) g_{2} (r))^{y} (g_{2} (r))^{$$

appropriate for two W ZW models SU (4N ) $_1$ .

Let us express all other terms in the action by means of  $\ _a$  and  $\ g_a$  . First of all the density of state operator becomes

$$\frac{1}{Q_0} \operatorname{Tr}[s_3 Q(\mathbf{r})] = \operatorname{Tr} \operatorname{T}^2(\mathbf{r}) = 2 \sum_{a=1}^{X^2} e^{i \frac{p_{\overline{N}}}{N} a(\mathbf{r})} \operatorname{Tr}[g_a(\mathbf{r})] + e^{i \frac{p_{\overline{N}}}{N} a(\mathbf{r})} \operatorname{Tr} g_a(\mathbf{r})^Y : (83)$$

M oreover one readily nds that

$$\frac{1}{Q_0^2} \operatorname{Tr} (Q_a(\mathbf{r}))^{(a)} (Q_a(\mathbf{r})) = 16 (Q_a(\mathbf{r}))^{(a)} (Q_a(\mathbf{r}))$$

and

$$\frac{1}{Q_0^4} \operatorname{Tr}[_{3 2} s_1 Q_a(r) Q_a(r)]^{(a)} \operatorname{Tr}[_{3 2} s_1 Q_a(r) Q_a(r)] = \frac{(16N)^2}{N} Q_a(r)^2 Q_a(r)^2 Q_a(r)^2$$

In conclusion the action expressed in terms of the fundamental elds and including the W ZW term reads

$$S_{W ZW} = \begin{cases} X & Z \\ & dr_{\overline{4}} & Tr (g_{a}(r))^{(a)} (g_{a}(r))^{Y} + 2 & (1+N) (g_{a}(r))^{(a)} (g_{a}($$

with

$$S^{(a)} = i \frac{1}{12} d^{3}r \qquad Tr g_{a} (r)^{y} Q_{a} (r) g_{a} (r)^{y} Q_{a} (r) g_{a} (r) g_{a} (r) g_{a} (r) ; \qquad (85)$$

where the plus refers to a = 1 and the m inus to a = 2.

# IX. CONSEQUENCES OF THE W ZW TERM

We have just shown that the actual eld theory which describes d-wave superconductors in the presence of a disorder which only perm its intra-node scattering processes is not a conventional non linear -m odel but instead it represents two decoupled U (1) SU (4N ) W ZW m odels. M oreover if, for instance, we consider pair 1, then

$$\frac{2}{4} \frac{2}{v_F^2 + v^2} d^2 r v_F^2 \operatorname{Tr} (\theta g_a(r)) (\theta g_a(r))^{Y} + v^2 \operatorname{Tr} (\theta g_a(r)) (\theta g_a(r))^{Y}$$

$$= \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{4} \frac{v_F^2 + v^2}{2} \frac{2}{v_F v} \frac{2}{v_F^2 + v^2} d^2 r v_F^2 \operatorname{Tr} (\theta g_a(r)) (\theta g_a(r))^{Y} + v^2 \operatorname{Tr} (\theta g_a(r)) (\theta g_a(r))^{Y}$$

$$= \frac{1}{8} \frac{d^2 r}{v_F v} v_F^2 \operatorname{Tr} (\theta g_a(r)) (\theta g_a(r))^{Y} + v^2 \operatorname{Tr} (\theta g_a(r)) (\theta g_a(r))^{Y} ;$$

which, upon the change of variable  $! v_{\rm F}$  and ! v, shows that each W ZW model is right at its xed point. Hence there is no ambiguity in the zero replica limit.

Now we can draw some consequences of what we have found. The rst is that the average value of the density of states ( $D \circ S$ ) at the chem ical potential stays zero, as in the absence of disorder and contrary to the B orn approximation. In particular the dimension of the density of states operator in the zero replica lim it N ! 0 is

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

while the dimension of the frequency is [!] = 2 (1) = 1 + . This implies that the DOS at nite frequency behaves as

N (!) 
$$j! \frac{1}{2^{+}};$$
 (86)

in agreem ent with Ref. [19].

Notice the (86) stems from the fact that the W ZW terms modiles the non-linear -model results leading to Eq. (66) in two ways: i) it makes unrenormalized as well as , ii) it adds the further contribution one to the dimension of the density of states operator. The only dimensione between the 1d mapping and the non-linear -model results for the density of states are the constant factors is well by the range of validity. If mapping: N (!)  $1=(v_F v_F v_F)!$  (!= ) 2=(1+1) with ! < ; non-linear -model: N (!)  $N_0(!_0)^{(1-1)}=(1+1)$  with ! < 1= 0, N 0 being the saddle point value of the density of states. At leading ording in  $u^2$  the matching of the two expressions is provided by N  $_{0,0}$  1.

The second consequence concerns the transport properties. We have shown that within the Born approximation a nite spin-conductivity arises. Is this result still true beyond that approximation? The renormalization group analysis which identiates the spin conductivity with the coupling of the non-linear -model would say that stays unrenormalized to its xed point value. Can we understand this in the 1d mapping language?.

In order to answer this question, we introduce a uniform spin vector potential within the action, which in our path-integral approach has the form

$$A = A_{0} + A_{1} + S_{1}$$
(87)

The action becomes now a functional of A, i.e. S! S(A), and the spin-conductivity turns out to be given by

I

$$_{s} = \frac{1}{2} \quad \frac{(2^{2} \ln Z (A))}{(2A_{0}^{2})} \quad \frac{(2^{2} \ln Z (A))}{(2A_{1}^{2})} \quad = \frac{1}{2} \quad \frac{(2^{2} \ln Z (A))}{(2A_{0}^{2})} \quad \frac{(2^{2} \ln Z (A))}{(2A_{1}^{2})} \quad = \frac{1}{2} \quad (88)$$

where

$$Z (A) = DQ(r)^{S(A)}$$

is the generating functional in the presence of A. It is possible to show that at second order in A one needs just to make the following substitution in the action

$$Q(\mathbf{r}) ! Q(\mathbf{r}) + \frac{i}{2} Q(\mathbf{r}); A ]:$$
 (89)

Upon the action of (32)

$$A ! U^{Y}A U = A_{0}_{3} + A_{1}_{3}_{2} s_{3};$$

and we can show that (89) in plies the following transformation law of the matrix eld G (r) in the presence of A

G (r) ! 
$$e^{\frac{i}{2}\int dr^{0}} (A_{0}(r^{0}) + A_{1}(r^{0}) + 2 + 3)} G(r) e^{\frac{i}{2}\int dr^{0}} (A_{0}(r^{0}) + A_{1}(r^{0}) + 2 + 3)}$$
; (90)

In order to better understand the role of A it is convenient to translate the W ZW action into the language of the underneath free one-dimensional fermions. One may identify the component  $G_1$ ; (r) of the matrix eld for pair 1", where and nun over 4N indices, with

$$G_{1}$$
; (r) ! i <sub>1:R</sub> (r) <sup>Y</sup><sub>1:L</sub> (r); (91)

being  $_{1; R}$  (r) and  $_{1; L}$  (r) right and left moving one dimensional Ferm i elds, respectively, and the two component vector r playing the role of space and time coordinates. Since pair  $2^{"}$  has the opposite W ZW term of pair  $1^{"}$ , it is more appropriate to de ne

$$G_{2}$$
; (r)!  $i_{2,L}$  (r)  $\frac{V}{2,R}$  (r); (92)

which form ally yields to equal W ZW terms. Then (90) in plies for the ferm ions the transform ation laws

$$\begin{array}{rcl} {}_{1;\mathbb{R}}(\mathbf{r}) & ! & e^{\frac{i}{2}\int d\mathbf{r}^{0}} & {}^{(\mathbb{A}_{0}(\mathbf{r}^{0})_{3} - \mathbb{A}_{1}(\mathbf{r}^{0})_{2} - 3)} & {}_{1;\mathbb{R}}(\mathbf{r}); \\ {}_{1;\mathbb{L}}(\mathbf{r}) & ! & e^{\frac{i}{2}\int d\mathbf{r}^{0}} & {}^{(\mathbb{A}_{0}(\mathbf{r}^{0})_{3} + \mathbb{A}_{1}(\mathbf{r}^{0})_{2} - 3)} & {}_{1;\mathbb{L}}(\mathbf{r}); \\ {}_{2;\mathbb{R}}(\mathbf{r}) & ! & e^{\frac{i}{2}\int d\mathbf{r}^{0}} & {}^{(\mathbb{A}_{0}(\mathbf{r}^{0})_{3} + \mathbb{A}_{1}(\mathbf{r}^{0})_{2} - 3)} & {}_{2;\mathbb{R}}(\mathbf{r}); \\ {}_{2;\mathbb{L}}(\mathbf{r}) & ! & e^{\frac{i}{2}\int d\mathbf{r}^{0}} & {}^{(\mathbb{A}_{0}(\mathbf{r}^{0})_{3} - \mathbb{A}_{1}(\mathbf{r}^{0})_{2} - 3)} & {}_{2;\mathbb{L}}(\mathbf{r}); \end{array}$$

which we may interpret as if A  $_0$  couples to the spin-density operator

$$X_{\substack{y\\ i;R}}(r)_{3 i;R}(r) + \frac{y}{i;L}(r)_{3 i;L}(r); \qquad (93)$$
  
i=1;2

while A<sub>1</sub> to the spin-current operator

$$y_{1;R}(\mathbf{r}) = y_{1;R}(\mathbf{r}) \qquad y_{1;L}(\mathbf{r}) = y_{1;L}(\mathbf{r}) \qquad y_{2;R}(\mathbf{r}) = y_{2;R}(\mathbf{r}) + y_{2;L}(\mathbf{r}) = y_{2;L}(\mathbf{r}) = y_{2;L}(\mathbf{r})$$
(94)

Since the ferm ions are free, apart from the abelian sector which is not coupled to A, the susceptibility towards A<sub>0</sub> is the same as that towards A<sub>1</sub>, hence the spin-conductivity would seem to vanish at ! strictly equal to zero, again unlike what we found within the Born

approximation. Actually one has to be more careful in drawing such a conclusion. Let us suppose to do the same calculation at nite frequency ! and afterwards send ! ! 0. A frequency ! • 0 plays the role of an explicit dimerization in the one dimensional fermionic problem :

It is straightforward to show that in the presence of a nite dimerization 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 anomaly which plays such an important role in this problem <sup>19</sup>. Since it is physically more appropriate to identify the spin conductance through the ! ! 0 limit, 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 chemical potential, namely that quasiparticle motion is undamped hence remains ballistic, yet the spin conductivity acquires a nite value in agreement with the D rude approximation.

# X. INTER-NODE SCATTERING PROCESSES

7

7.

So far we have just considered the role of in purity scattering within each node. Now let us extend our analysis by including also inter-node scattering processes. Upon integrating out the most general disorder, we not two additional terms. The rst describes opposite node scattering processes, and it reads:

$$S_{im p}^{I} = \sqrt[4]{2} dr - \frac{1}{1}(r) - \frac{1}{1}(r) - \frac{1}{1}(r) + \frac{1}{2}(r) - \frac$$

The second derives from the impurity scattering processes which couple the two pairs of nodes, and it is given by

$$S_{im p}^{II} = w^{2} dr _{1}(r) _{2}(r) _{2}(r) _{1}(r) + _{\overline{1}}(r) _{\overline{2}}(r) _{\overline{2}}(r) _{\overline{1}}(r) + _{1}(r) _{\overline{2}}(r) _{\overline{2}}(r) _{1}(r) + _{\overline{1}}(r) _{2}(r) _{2}(r) _{1}(r) : (97)$$

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

$$S_{imp}^{I} = \frac{I N_{0}}{Q_{0}} dr Tr [Q(r)_{1}Q(r)_{1}]; \qquad (98)$$

and

$$S_{imp}^{II} = \prod_{i=0;1}^{II} \frac{N_{0}}{Q_{0}} \sum_{i=0;1}^{Z} Tr[Q(r)_{1,i}Q(r)_{1,i}];$$
(99)

where

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

The st 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 symmetric Q -combinations of opposite nodes stay massless, the -term disappears and the coset for soft modes is Sp (2N) 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 agreement with the known results<sup>7,19,22</sup>. In the absence of isotropic scattering the vanishing of the function still indicates that the spin and heat conductivities have a metallic behavior.

Finally, in the generic case in which all nodes are coupled only the four nodes symmetric combination of the Q's is required for the soft modes. The coset is again Sp (2N), but now it represents degrees of freedom coming from all nodes. The two W ZW terms are written in terms of the same Q and they cancels since they have opposite sign. The action then reduce to the  $S_{NLM}$  as derived by [5].

#### A. Scaling analysis of the general model

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



FIG. 1: Interaction vertices for the most general disorder. Solid (dashed) lines refer to right (left) moving 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  $a;a^{0} = 1;:::;N$  to the replicas. The symbol  $^{0}$  in front of the  $g_{3}$  and  $g_{3b}$  coupling constants means + 1 if  $= ^{0}$  and -1 otherw ise.

W e represent the matrix elds for pair 1" according to:

$$G_{1; a; 0 0a^{0}} = i_{1;R; a} \bigvee_{1;L; 0 0a^{0}}^{Y};$$

$$G_{1; a; 0 0a^{0}} = i_{1;L; a} \bigvee_{1;R; 0 0a^{0}}^{Y};$$

$$G_{\overline{1}; a; 0 0a^{0}} = 1_{2} G_{1}^{Y} 2_{1} \otimes \bigcup_{a^{0}}^{Y}; a$$

$$= i_{1} \otimes \bigcup_{1;L; 0 0a^{0}}^{Y}; a$$

$$G_{\overline{1}; a; 0 0a^{0}} = i_{1;R; 0 0a^{0}}^{Y}; a$$
(100)

As we mentioned, since pair \2" has the opposite W ZW term of pair \1", it is convenient to de ne  $G_{2; a; 0 0a^0} = i_{2;L; a} \frac{Y}{2;R; 0 0a^0}$ . In such a way the two W ZW terms become equal leaving no ambiguity in mapping the non-linear -model onto a one-dimensional model of interacting electrons with the interaction vertices drawn in Fig. 1. We notice that the coupling g in Fig. 1 derives from the two terms in Eq. (64). The bare values of the coupling constants are approximately

$$g^{(0)} ' u^{2};$$

$$g_{3}^{(0)} ' v^{2};$$

$$g_{b}^{(0)} = g_{3b}^{(0)} ' w^{2};$$

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

$$\frac{dg}{d \ln s} = g_3^2 + g_b^2 + g_{3b}^2;$$
  

$$\frac{dg_3}{d \ln s} = 4gg_3 + 4g_bg_{3b};$$
  

$$\frac{dg_b}{d \ln s} = 2gg_b + 2g_3g_{3b};$$
  

$$\frac{dg_{3b}}{d \ln s} = 2g_3g_b + 2g_{3b}g;$$

where s ! 1 is the scaling parameter. As discussed in Ref. [20], the velocity anisotropy does not enter the RG equations, which remains true at least up to two loops in our fermionic replica trick approach. It is convenient to de neg =  $g_{3b}$  g, so that

$$\frac{dg}{d \ln s} = g_3^2 + \frac{1}{2} g_+^2 + g^2 ;$$
  

$$\frac{dg_3}{d \ln s} = 4gg_3 + g_+^2 g^2 ;$$
  

$$\frac{dg_+}{d \ln s} = 2(g + g_3)g_+;$$
  

$$\frac{dg}{d \ln s} = 2(g - g_3)g :$$

G iven the appropriate bare values of the amplitudes, one readily recognizes that the RG ow maintains the initial condition g = 0, hence the scaling equations reduce to

$$\frac{dg}{d\ln s} = g_3^2 + \frac{1}{2}g_+^2; \qquad (101)$$

$$\frac{dg_3}{d\ln s} = 4gg_3 + g_+^2;$$
(102)

$$\frac{dg_{+}}{d\ln s} = 2 (g + g_{3}) g_{+} :$$
(103)

The RG equations with the appropriate initial conditions always ow to strong coupling with

$$g_3 \quad 2g \quad g ! \quad \frac{1}{3} \frac{1}{\ln s_c \quad \ln s};$$

where  $s_c$  can be interpreted as the correlation length of the modes which acquire a mass gap  $E_c$  by the interaction, with  $p_{----}$ 

$$E_{c}' \frac{p_{\overline{v_F v}}}{s_c}:$$
(104)

Therefore the two pairs of nodes get strongly coupled, in agreem ent with Refs. [19,20,22].

#### B. Strong coupling analysis

In order to gain further insight into the strong coupling phase towards which RG ow s, let us consider the case of a single replica N = 1. For further simplication it is convenient to adopt the same approach as in Refs. 5,19,20,22 and neglect the role of the opposite frequencies, which amounts to drop the -label. The model thus reduces to two interacting chains of spinful fermions, each chain representing a pair of nodes. The coupling g of Fig. 1 only couples to the charge sector and makes the intra-chain um klapp, the coupling  $g_3$ , a relevant perturbation which opens a charge gap on each chain. Therefore the model is equivalent to two coupled spin-1/2 chains. If we denote by  $n_{1(2)}(x)$  and  $_{1(2)}(x)$  respectively the staggered magnetization and the dimerization of chain 1(2), the coupling among the chains is ferrom agnetic and given by

$$w^{2} dx_{1}(x)_{2}(x) 4n_{1}(x)_{n}(x)$$

As shown in Ref. 29, this model is equivalent to an SO (4) G ross-N eveau which turns out to be fully massive or, equivalently, by four two-dimensional o -critical classical Ising models, three ordered and one disordered,  $h_1i = h_2i = h_3i = h_4i = 0$ , where i and i,  $i = 1; \dots; 4$ , are order and disorder parameters, respectively. The ground state is rigid to an external magnetic eld and to a spin vector potential opposite for the two chains, hence the conductivity is zero. As we discussed, a nite frequency amounts to add a term

$$\frac{1}{2} \quad \frac{1}{2} \quad \frac{1}$$

which actually plays the role of an external magnetic eld acting on the fourth disordered Ising copy. The net result is that  $h_4(x)i_{! \in 0}$  !, which in turns mean that the DOS remains linear in frequency. Even in the presence of an explicit dimerization, the susceptibilities towards a magnetic eld or towards a spin vector potential opposite for the two chains still vanish. Were these results valid for any N, even for N ! 0, we should conclude that i) the model is indeed insulating; ii) the DOS is linear in frequency, in full agreement with Ref. 6.

## C. Identi cation of relevant energy scales

The previous analysis of the N = 1 m odel shows that the vanishing of therm al and spin conductivities in the model for a disordered d-wave superconductor translates in the language

of the elective one-dimensional fermionic model into the existence of a nite spin-gap. The correlation length associated with this gap should then represent the localization length of the Bogoliubov quasiparticles. We may estimate this correlation length as the scale  $s_c$  at which the RG equations (101-103) encounter a singularity. In addition we may introduce the mass gap  $E_c$  through Eq. (104) which can be identified as the energy scale around which localization elects appear. It is worth noticing that s underestimates the spin correlation length, hence the actual localization length. The 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 lects charge degrees of freedom, the largest gap is expected in the charge sector, the spin gap being smaller. Keeping this in mind, in what follows we shall discuss how  $s_c$ , or better  $E_c$ , depend on the range of the disorder potential.

First of all we need to identify some reference scale to compare with  $E_c$ . The natural candidate would be the inverse relaxation time 1 = 0 in the Born approximation. In the generic case  $u^2 = w^2 = v^2$ ,  $1 = 0 = 2Q_0$  where  $Q_0$  is obtained by Eq. (56) with  $u^2$  substituted by  $u^2 + 2w^2 + v^2$ . We expect that the actual  $E_c$  is always smaller then 1 = 0, the two values being closest for extrem ely short-range disorder, namely  $u^2 = w^2 = v^2$ . Since the derivation of the non-linear -m odel does not provide with the precise dependence of the initial values of the coupling constants,  $g^{(0)}$ ,  $g_3^{(0)}$  and  $g_4^{(0)}$ , on the in purity potential, we will assume that the short range disorder corresponds to  $2g^{(0)} = g_3^{(0)} = g_4^{(0)}$  and moreover that the mass gap  $E_c$  in this case can be identified as 1 = 0 in the Born approximation. Upon integrating the RG equations (101-103) with this initial condition, the value of  $E_c$  ' = 0 is found to be

$$\frac{1}{0}' \exp \frac{1}{2g^{(0)} + g_3^{(0)} + g_+^{(0)}} ; \qquad (105)$$

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  $g = 2g^{(0)} + g_3^{(0)} + g_+^{(0)}$ , i.e. at constant 1 = 0, and increasing the value of  $g^{(0)}$  at expenses of  $g_3^{(0)} + g_+^{(0)} = g_0 - 2g^{(0)}$ . One readily realizes that as  $g^{(0)}$  increases  $E_c$  decreases from its short-range value (105). For instance, if we assume  $g_3^{(0)} = 0$  and  $g_+^{(0)} = g_0 - 2g^{(0)} - g_0$ , then

$$E_{c}' \frac{1}{0} \frac{eg_{+}^{(0)}}{4g_{0}} \frac{\frac{1}{g_{0}}}{0}$$

which explicitly shows that localization e ects may show up at energies/tem peratures much

sm aller than the 1 = 0 in the Born approximation.

## XI. CONCLUSIONS

In this work we have presented a derivation of the non-linear -m odel for disordered d-wave superconductors able to deal with a nite range in purity potential, namely with an intra-node scattering potential generically di erent from the inter-nodal one. W ithin this derivation we have been able to clarify some controversial issues concerning the validity of a conventional non-linear -m odel approach when dealing with disordered D irac ferm ions. We have indeed found that the non-linear -model approach is actually equivalent to the alternative method st introduced in Ref.19 which consists in mapping the disordered model onto a one-dimensional model of interacting fermions. The energy upper cut-o is provided by the inverse Born 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 emerges for d-wave superconductors is the existence of a Wess-Zum ino-Novikov-Witten term related to the vorticity of the spectrum in momentum space. Both these features are responsible of several interesting phenom ena. For instance, unlike conventional disordered systems, in this case disorder starts playing a role (particularly in the density of states) when quasiparticle motion is still ballistic. In contrast, the on-set of localization precursor e ects is pushed towards energies/tem peratures lower than the inverse relaxation time in the D rude approximation. M ore specially, the longer is the range of the impurity potential the later localization e ects appear. This result may explain why experiments have so often failed to detect localization precursor e ects in cuprates superconductors.

A cknow ledgm ents: LD acknow ledges support from the SFB TR 12 of the DFG and the EU network HYSW IICH.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> P.A.Læ, Phys.Rev.Lett. 71, 1887 (1993); A.C.Durst, P.A.Læ, Phys.Rev.B 62, 1270 (2000).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> F.J.W egner, Z.Phys.B 35, 207 (1979).

<sup>36</sup> 

- <sup>3</sup> K B. Efetov, A J. Larkin and D E. Khm el'nitsky, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 79, 1120 (1979) [Sov. Phys. JETP 52, 568 (1980)].
- <sup>4</sup> A.Altland and M.R.Zimbauer, Phys.Rev.B 55, 1142 (1997).
- <sup>5</sup> T.Senthil, M.P.A.Fisher, L.Balents, and C.Nayak, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 4704 (1998).
- <sup>6</sup> T.Senthiland M PA.Fisher, Phys.Rev.B 60, 6893 (1999).
- <sup>7</sup> T.Fukui, Phys. Rev. B 62, R 9279 (2000).
- <sup>8</sup> A.G.Yashenkin, W.A.Atkinson, I.V.Gomyi, P.J.Hirschfeld and D.V.Khveshchenko, Phys. Rev.Lett. 86, 5982 (2001).
- <sup>9</sup> M.Fabrizio, L.Dell'Anna, and C.Castellani, Phys.Rev.Lett. 88, 076603 (2002).
- <sup>10</sup> P.J.Hirschfeld and W .A.Atkinson, J.Low Temp.Phys. 126, 881 (2002).
- <sup>11</sup> L.Dell'Anna, Nucl. Phys. B 758, 255 (2006).
- <sup>12</sup> N.E.Hussey, S.Nakamae, K.Behnia, H.Takagi, C.Urano, S.Adachi and S.Tajima, Phys. Rev.Lett. 85, 4140 (2000).
- <sup>13</sup> R.W. Hill, C. Proust, L. Taillefer, P. Fournier and R.L.Greene, Nature, 414, 711 (2001).
- <sup>14</sup> L.Taillefer, B.Lussier, R.Gagnon, K.Behnia and H.Aubin, Phys. Rev Lett. 79, 483 (1997).
- <sup>15</sup> M.Chiao, R.W. Hill, C.Lupien, L.Taillefer, P.Lambert, R.Gagnon and P.Fournier, Phys. Rev.B 62, 3554 (2000).
- <sup>16</sup> M .Sutherland et al., Phys. Rev. B 67, 174520 (2003).
- <sup>17</sup> J. Takeya, Y. Ando, S. Kom iya and X. F. Sun, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 077001 (2002).
- <sup>18</sup> M.Bruno, A.Toschi, L.Dell'Anna, and C.Castellani, Phys. Rev. B 72, 104512 (2005).
- <sup>19</sup> A.A.Nersesyan, A.M.Tsvelik, and F.W enger, Phys.Rev.Lett. 72, 2628 (1994); A.A.Nersesyan, A.M.Tsvelik, and F.W enger, Nucl. Phys.B 438, 561 (1995).
- <sup>20</sup> A.Altland, B.D. Simons, and M.R. Zimbauer, Phys. Rep. 359, 283 (2002).
- <sup>21</sup> D.J.Scalapino, T.S.Nunner, and P.J.Hirschfeld, cond-m at/0409204; T.S.Nunner, and P. J.Hirschfeld, Phys. Rev. B 72, 014514 (2005).
- <sup>22</sup> P.Fendley and R M .Konik, Phys. Rev. B 62, 9359 (2000).
- <sup>23</sup> For intra-and inter-opposite-node scattering, the non-linear -m odel coupling is instead of order one irrespectively of the velocity an isotropy, see the text below.
- <sup>24</sup> M.Fabrizio and C.Castellani, Nucl. Phys. B 583, 542 (2000).
- <sup>25</sup> R.Gade and F.W egner, Nucl. Phys. B 360, 213 (1991); R.Gade, ibid. 398, 499 (1993).
- <sup>26</sup> O.Motrunich, K.Dam le, and D.A.Huse, Phys. Rev. B 65, 064206 (2002); P.Le Doussal, and

T.Giam archi, Physica C 331 233 (2000).

- <sup>27</sup> C.Mudry, S.Ryu, and A.Furusaki, Phys.Rev.B 67, 064202 (2003); H.Yam ada, and T.Fukui, Nucl.Phys.B 679 632 (2004).
- <sup>28</sup> L.Dell'Anna, Nucl. Phys. B 750, 213 (2006).
- <sup>29</sup> A A.Nersesyan and A M.T svelik, Phys.Rev.Lett. 78, 3939 (1997).