

P U P T 1489, I A S S N S 94/59

cond-mat/

July 1994

Renormalization Group Approach to Low Temperature Properties of a Non-Fermi Liquid Metal

Chetan Nayak[?]

Department of Physics
Joseph Henry Laboratories
Princeton University
Princeton, N.J. 08544

Frank Wilczek^y

School of Natural Sciences
Institute for Advanced Study
Olden Lane
Princeton, N.J. 08540

[?] Research supported in part by a Fannie and John Hertz Foundation fellowship. nayak@puhep1.princeton.edu

^y Research supported in part by DOE grant DE-FG02-90ER40542. WILCZEK@IASNS.BITNET

ABSTRACT

We expand upon an earlier renormalization group analysis of a non-Fermi liquid fixed point that plausibly governs the two dimensional electron liquid in a magnetic field near filling fraction $\nu = 1/2$. We give a more complete description of our somewhat unorthodox renormalization group transformation by relating both our field-theoretic approach to a direct mode elimination and our anisotropic scaling to the general problem of incorporating curvature of the Fermi surface. We derive physical consequences of the fixed point by showing how they follow from renormalization group equations for finite-size scaling, where the size may be set by the temperature or by the frequency of interest. In order fully to exploit this approach, it is necessary to take into account composite operators, including in some cases dangerous "irrelevant" operators. We devote special attention to gauge invariance, both as a formal requirement and in its positive role providing Ward identities constraining the renormalization of composite operators. We emphasize that new considerations arise in describing properties of the physical electrons (as opposed to the quasiparticles.) We propose an experiment which, if feasible, will allow the most characteristic feature of our results, that is the divergence of the effective mass of the quasiparticle near the nominal Fermi surface, to be tested directly. Some comparison with other recent, related work is attempted.

1. Introduction

In remarkable work, Halperin, Lee, and Read [1] have developed a theory of the two-dimensional electron gas that has gained some important experimental support [2]. Their theory is based on the idea, suggested in the early literature of anyon physics [3] and used to great effect in the theory of anyon superconductivity [4,5], of approximating the effect of quantum statistics in an assembly of identical particles by a uniform magnetic field. Recall that in $2+1$ dimensions one can transmute the statistics of particles [6] by attaching fictitious charge and flux to them, or equivalently by coupling them to a Chern-Simons gauge field [7]. The long-range part of the fictitious gauge field (that is, the vector potential) accruing to an assembly of many identical particles simply tracks the number of particles inside, according to Stokes' theorem, because each particle contributes a definite amount of flux. Thus one may remove the longest-range part of the statistical vector potential by replacing it with that of a uniform magnetic field, hoping to treat the residual part as a regular, essentially local and therefore non-singular, perturbation. Precisely at $\nu = 1/2$ the background fictitious field thus introduced cancels the real external magnetic field, suggesting that at this filling factor the electrons can be treated as free fermions coupled to the residual gauge field. Jain [8] has also fruitfully emphasized, from a somewhat different point of view, the importance of representing electrons as particle-fictitious flux composites, and the special significance of filling factors where the real and fictitious flux cancel. A general view of the phase diagram in the magnetic field-statistics plane incorporating these insights, consistently founded on the idea that generic small, local perturbations on systems with a gap (or perhaps even systems having small phase space for low-energy excitations, as around a Fermi surface) do not change their qualitative properties, has been proposed [9].

Besides its phenomenological success in a somewhat esoteric corner of condensed matter physics, and its profitable use of glamorous theoretical ideas, there is another important reason to be interested in the theory of Halperin, Lee, and

Read: it gives us the first clearly formulated example of a non-Fermi liquid metal outside of $1+1$ dimensions. There is significant evidence that the copper-oxide superconductors are, in their normal state, $2+1$ -dimensional non-Fermi liquid metals, as Anderson has advocated forcefully for several years now; for recent reviews see [10] and [20]. For all these reasons, it seems important to examine the theory closely, and to develop techniques for treating it more rigorously.

The original calculations of Halperin, Lee, and Read were essentially sophisticated perturbative calculations. (In this context by sophisticated perturbation theory we mean, for instance, that appropriate self-energies, rather than, say, propagators are calculated perturbatively. In Feynman graphs, this amounts to summation of selected infinite sums of graphs, e.g. rainbows.) However the relevant coupling constant is not small, and it is unclear a priori why the calculations work as well as they do. It comes, perhaps, more as a relief than a surprise that some recent measurements do not seem to agree with the perturbative results, even qualitatively [12]. These are measurements of the effective mass as a function of deviation from half-filling, a quantity which (we shall argue) is plausibly sensitive to the running of the gauge coupling. The running of the gauge coupling is an effect that is not included in the original calculations.

Several approaches to improving the original calculations have been proposed in the literature [13–21]. We shall discuss them further, and especially their relation to the approach adopted here and in our previous work [14], in our concluding remarks.

Our work is based on applying conventional renormalization group ideas to the coupled fermion-Chern-Simons system including, importantly, an intrinsic long-range fermion-fermion interaction. We find an infrared fixed point that plausibly governs the infrared behavior for the Hall effect near $\nu = 1/2$. This analysis forms a direct extension of a similar approach to Fermi liquid theory that has been extensively developed recently [22,23,24]. Indeed, our fixed point merges into the Fermi liquid fixed point, which is simply effective gauge coupling $\rightarrow 0$, when the

intrinsic Fermion repulsion is sufficiently long-range. (Of course, if the interactions are sufficiently singular they could in themselves spoil conventional Fermi liquid behavior.) In the interesting critical case of $1=j$ interactions (as one has due to real { i.e. electromagnetic { Coulomb repulsion), the approach to zero coupling is logarithmic.

In this paper, we revisit our non-Fermi liquid fixed point. Our goals in doing this are three-fold. First, we want to show that the somewhat unconventional aspects of our earlier formulation, specifically the use of singularities in dimensional regularization to identify renormalizations, and the use of anisotropic scaling, are not essential { everything can be done in a conventional mode-elimination scheme. We shall also discuss the technical issue of gauge invariance in a bit more detail. Second, we will calculate more { specifically, the anomalous dimensions of operators corresponding to marginal perturbations of Fermi liquid theory: the Landau parameters, impurity scattering, and the Cooper instability channel. We show that the Fermi liquid parameters remain marginal as a result of the Ward identities, despite 1-loop corrections which are unique to the non-Fermi liquid. Impurity scattering and the Cooper instability exhibit more interesting behaviors. Third, we want to use the developed machinery to derive physical consequences. The most fundamental of these, that tests the most characteristic property directly, concerns the speed of ballistic propagation of quasiparticles. We compute in addition the temperature dependence of various thermodynamic properties and transport coefficients from simple renormalization group equations and finite-size scaling. These methods are explicated in the context of Fermi and Luttinger liquid theory in a companion paper [15]. In this connection we will emphasize an important point that we treated very sloppily in [14], namely that the quasiparticles are fundamentally different objects from the electrons, a fact that drastically affects the calculation of some physical quantities while making hardly any difference for others.

2. A Renormalization Group Manifesto

In [14], a somewhat unusual scaling was used in the renormalization group procedure: momenta perpendicular and parallel to the Fermi surface were scaled differently. In order to elucidate the logic behind this scaling, we will consider the case of a flat Fermi surface, relevant to the $k_F \rightarrow 1$ limit and perhaps to the Fermi surfaces produced by tight-binding Hamiltonians. In this context, we explore the freedom available in the definition of the renormalization group. We then restore curvature to the Fermi surface and show that the scaling of [14] is the correct one for this problem. The invariance of the effective Lagrangian under this scaling, together with the one-loop calculation of renormalization functions, may be used to write the scaling form of the free energy. The temperature dependence is determined by finite-size scaling, where the inverse temperature, β , is the "size" in the time direction.

Since we will be using renormalization group transformations of a different flavor from those familiar in other contexts, it is useful to review the basic requirements that such a transformation must satisfy:

1. High momentum degrees of freedom should be removed. Their effect is retained only in their contribution to the effective Lagrangian for the low-energy degrees of freedom. This step (and all others) must be non-singular. In a perturbative scheme, this is typically done by evaluating graphs with the momenta in some directions on internal lines restricted to a narrow range at the cutoff. No external legs on these graphs, and hence no fields in the low-energy effective Lagrangian, may have momenta in this range. There is considerable freedom in this choice. For instance, one can eliminate a shell $d < (k_x^2 + k_y^2)^{1/2} < d + \delta$ or simply $d < k_x < d + \delta$. In either case, the denominators of internal propagators cannot become too small, so the procedure is non-singular.

2. The momenta should be rescaled so that the cutoff(s) are returned to their original values. In general, some of the momentum directions will be unrestricted in internal loops and in the low-energy Lagrangian (as the k_y integration is in

the second mode elimination scheme above). If the loop integrals are insensitive to the cut-offs in these directions, it is possible to simply take these cut-offs to infinity. These directions may then be freely rescaled. For instance, in the theory of dynamic critical phenomena [25] one integrates out high k modes but not high ω modes. Internal loops must have $d < k < \infty$ and external legs must have $k < d$ while both have $1 < \omega < \infty$. However, both k and ω are scaled, $k \rightarrow sk, \omega \rightarrow s^z \omega$.

3. The fields should be rescaled so that the quadratic part of the effective Lagrangian is returned to its original form. In general, it may not be possible to return all of the quadratic terms to their original form. In any given kinematical regime, some of the quadratic terms will set the scale for the important fluctuations; these are the terms which should be returned to their original form. The other terms will either grow or scale to zero as the renormalization group transformation is iterated. If they scale to zero, they may be ignored at low energy. If they grow, then they eventually become the important terms which set the scale for fluctuations and the field rescaling should be modified to preserve them.

Although strictly speaking it is not part of the definition of the renormalization group, it is nevertheless important to keep track of the symmetries of the problem. If one is looking for a fixed point which exhibits a certain symmetry, then one should choose a scaling in step 2 which respects this symmetry. It is also important to realize that there is not a one-to-one correspondence between the ways of carrying out steps 1 and 2. For instance, one could integrate out the circular shells, $d < (k_x^2 + k_y^2)^{1/2} < \infty$, or the independent rectangular shells, $d < k_x < \infty$ and $d < k_y < \infty$, but in either case, one rescales $k_x \rightarrow sk_x, k_y \rightarrow sk_y$. It is often convenient to use a regularization method which does not explicitly involve a strict limit on the momenta, but shifts the weight of momentum integrals away from high momenta in some other fashion. Then there will be one or more regulator parameters which will play a similar role to ϵ .

Of course the overarching concern in the choice of a renormalization group

transformation is that it leads to a workable calculational procedure. If one is interested in computing infrared behavior, this presumably means that it must lead to an infrared fixed point. The choices available in the scaling of the unintegrated directions, in the scaling of the fields, etc. should be exercised in such a way that the renormalization group transformation leads to a fixed point. If this can be done, the renormalization group allows one to relate difficult low-energy calculations to easy high-energy calculations. Suppose, for example, that we have a theory with a dimensionless coupling constant g and kinematics defined by momenta p_i some of which may have cutoffs Λ_i . Suppose further that we have defined a renormalization group transformation under which some of the cutoffs Λ_i have been lowered to $s^{\lambda_i} \Lambda_i$ in step 1 and that the coupling constant of the new effective Lagrangian is $g(s)$. Then the correlation functions satisfy:

$$G(p_i; \Lambda_i; g) = G(p_i; s^{\lambda_i} \Lambda_i; g(s)) \quad (2.1)$$

We now rescale the momenta by $p_i \rightarrow s^{\lambda_i} p_i$ (including some of the momenta with no cutoff) and the fields by the appropriate factors to obtain

$$G(p_i; \Lambda_i; g) = s G(s^{\lambda_i} p_i; \Lambda_i; g(s)) \quad (2.2)$$

where s arises from the field rescaling. If the renormalization group transformation has an infrared fixed point, $g(s) \rightarrow g$ as $s \rightarrow 0$, then we have:

$$G(p_i; \Lambda_i; g) \rightarrow s G(s^{\lambda_i} p_i; \Lambda_i; g) \quad (2.3)$$

The left-hand-side is difficult to calculate directly in the cases of interest when the momenta p_i are small. In particular, it is not analytic in g , and perturbation theory fails. However, if we have defined a useful renormalization group transformation, then the right-hand-side will be easier to calculate. This will be the case if the $s^{\lambda_i} p_i$'s are comparable to the Λ_i 's and if loop integrals really are insensitive to the lack of cutoffs in those directions which do not have them, since then

$G(s^{z_i} p_i; \dots; g)$ will not diverge as the p_i 's become small. (If g is small, one will have the added advantage of being able to calculate the right-hand-side in low order perturbation theory { this is infrared asymptotic freedom, and when it occurs precise asymptotic results are easily obtained.} For example, if there is only one p_i , we can take $s^{z_i} = \frac{p_i}{\Lambda}$:

$$G(p_i; \dots; g) = \frac{p_i}{\Lambda^{z_i}} G(\dots; g(p_i^{1-z_i})) : \quad (2.4)$$

Now $G(\dots; g(p_i^{1-z_i}))$ is just a constant so long as p is small enough that we can neglect the difference between $g(p^{1-z_i})$ and g .

3. Flat Fermi Surface

Let us now consider, in light of these remarks, excitations about a flat Fermi surface. The energy of an excitation is proportional to the distance to the surface. The free Lagrangian is:

$$S_0 = \int d^4k \int d^3x \psi^\dagger (k) \left(\epsilon - v_F k_y \right) \psi(k) \quad (3.1)$$

k_y is the direction perpendicular to the Fermi surface, and k_x is the direction parallel to the Fermi surface; $\psi(k) = \psi_F k_y$. Following Shankar [22], and in analogy with the theory of critical dynamics, we integrate out shells in k_y but let ϵ range from $-\epsilon_0$ to ϵ_0 . After integrating out the high k_y modes of $\psi(k)$, we can rescale $\epsilon \rightarrow \epsilon', k_y \rightarrow s k_y$, and $\epsilon_0 \rightarrow s^{\frac{3}{2}} \epsilon_0$. But what about k_x ? The quadratic term (3.1) by itself does not instruct us how to proceed; in particular, it may or may not be sensible to integrate out high k_x modes, because they do not necessarily have large energy (unless k_y is also large.) In fact, if we do integrate out these modes, we might be losing track of some low-energy processes that may be important for the calculation of certain properties. There is no symmetry which dictates the scaling of k_x , unlike the case of relativistic field theory. As long as one is interested

in processes that take place in the neighborhood of a single point on the Fermi surface, one can integrate out high k_x modes and scale $k_x \rightarrow s k_x$ for any s ; if one wants to consider processes that involve distant points, one must take $\epsilon = 0$?. For our later purposes it will be useful to consider non-zero ϵ ; then, to maintain the form of the action, we must scale $u \rightarrow \frac{3+\epsilon}{2} u$.

Let us consider the scaling of four-Fermi interactions under this transformation. The term

$$S_4 = \int d^4x d^3k_1 d^3k_2 d^3k_3 d^3k_4 u(k_{1x}; k_{2x}; k_{3x}) \delta(k_4 - k_1 - k_2 - k_3) \delta(k_{4x} - k_{1x} - k_{2x} - k_{3x}) \quad (3.2)$$

scales as $s^{-(k_4 - k_1 - k_2 - k_3)}$ and similarly for k_{4x} . Hence, it is irrelevant unless $\epsilon = 0$, for which case it is marginal. For any ϵ , however, the four-Fermi interaction is marginal in the kinematic configuration $k_{1x} = k_{3x}$ or $k_{2x} = k_{3x}$. Thus the Landau parameters $u(k_{1x}; k_{2x}; k_{1x})$ and $u(k_{1x}; k_{2x}; k_{2x})$ are marginal { since there is one fewer k_x integral the scaling is reduced by $s^{-\epsilon}$.

This analysis simply demonstrates that fermions at distinct points near a flat Fermi surface have marginal interactions. As one focusses on a single point, integrating out processes which occur far from the point, the only marginal interactions among the fermions are those that either preserve or exchange their k_x values.

It is instructive to consider the one-loop β -functional for these marginal four-Fermi interactions. It vanishes. The reason [22] for this is that in the absence of momentum transfer the internal momenta must be on the Fermi surface. In an explicit mode elimination ("Wilsonian") formulation such momenta are not subject to elimination; with other types of ("field theoretic") regulators one still obtains a null result because the graphs are perfectly finite as the cutoff is taken to infinity. This result will come as no surprise to readers familiar with the literature of Luttinger liquids (e.g. [26], [27]): for one might as well consider k_x here as an

? Of course it possible for scattering to distant points on the Fermi surface to occur as a virtual process; if these are relevant, a full renormalization-group analysis must include them explicitly.

internal quantum number, and then the system could be interpreted as a chain of coupled chiral Luttinger liquids, which are famous for their marginal interactions.

However, for our present purposes it is more useful to interpret k_x as a direction in momentum space, so we can introduce transverse gauge fields. We shall introduce a Chern-Simons gauge field whose mean field is cancelled and whose fluctuations are controlled by a $\frac{1}{k_x}$ interaction as in [1,14].[?] One can use the constraint arising from varying the vector potential a_0 to recast the $1/k_x^2$ repulsion between fermions into the form

$$S_a = \int d^2k \sum_{ijmn} k_i k_m k_x a_j(k;!) a_n(-k;!) : \quad (3.3)$$

Assuming that this term dictates the scaling of the vector potentials, we find $a_x \sim s^{\frac{1}{2}(4+(1-x))} a_x$, $a_y \sim s^{\frac{1}{2}(1+(3-x))} a_y$. (Note that here we have assumed $k_y \ll k_x$, as is appropriate for $x < 1$.) We then find that the interaction between the gauge field and the fermions,

$$g \int d^2k d^2q \sum_i (k+q;!) + (!^0) (k;!) a_i(q;!) \frac{\partial}{\partial k_i} (q+2k) \quad (3.4)$$

scales as $s^{-(1-x)/2}$. Hence this interaction is relevant, or at least marginal, so long as $x < 1$.

To check this, let us consider the structure of a typical one-loop graph. Figure 1 shows the one-loop vertex correction. Its value is:

$$(gv_F)^2 \int d^2k \frac{1}{(2-)^3} \frac{1}{k_y} \frac{1}{i} \frac{1}{F(p_y - k_y)} \frac{1}{k_x^2 k_x} \quad (3.5)$$

This graph is infrared divergent if the range of integration includes the origin; thus the cutoff has teeth, and some of the integrations must be restricted to a

[?] This number x , of course, is not to be confused with the direction x . We are following here, as we did in [14], the original notation of [1]. The reader should be warned that, lamentably, some authors [16] have chosen to use the same symbol x to denote our $1-x$.

narrow band at the cut-off. It is quite clear that the k_x integration is the problem. Restricting the integration in the k_y direction alone is not sufficient because the denominator of the gauge field propagator can still become small; it is necessary to restrict the k_x integration to a narrow band at the cut-off.

Restricting the k_x integration to $-\Lambda < k_x < \Lambda$ is sufficient to make this integral finite. Furthermore, we can take the Λ and k_y cut-offs to infinity and integrate these variables over their full range in loop integrals.^y Then, (3.5) can be evaluated (to lowest order in $1 - x$):

$$(gv_F)^2 \int \frac{d^2 k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{i} \frac{1}{\mathbb{F}k_y} \frac{1}{i} \frac{1}{\mathbb{F}(p_y - k_y)} \frac{1}{k_x^2 k_x} = \frac{g^2 v_F}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{d}{dx} \quad (3.6)$$

The fermion self-energy diagram may be handled similarly:

$$(gv_F)^2 \int \frac{d^2 k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{i} \frac{1}{\mathbb{F}(p_y - k_y)} \frac{1}{k_x^2 k_x} = \frac{g^2 v_F}{2\pi^2} \frac{d}{dx} \quad (3.7)$$

These may be used to derive recursion relations for g and v_F ,

$$\frac{d}{d \ln} (gv_F) = -\frac{1}{2} (1 - x) (gv_F) + \frac{g^2 v_F}{(2\pi)^2} (gv_F) \quad (3.8)$$

$$\frac{d}{d \ln} v_F = \frac{g^2 v_F}{(2\pi)^2} v_F \quad (3.9)$$

In [14], equivalent results were obtained by a field theoretic technique involving a regularization procedure similar to dimensional regularization. The pole parts in $(1 - x)$ of the integrals in (3.6) and (3.7) are cancelled by renormalization counterterms (more details will be given in the next section). This procedure

^y This is certainly not the unique choice. One can integrate out shells of any shape, so long as $k_x = 0$ is excluded. Of course, the final answers will not depend on this choice. One should keep the analogy with critical dynamics in mind. In that case, one integrates out high k modes and scales to the low k , $\Lambda \rightarrow 0$ limit; in this case, one integrates out high k_x modes and scales to the low k_x , k_y , $\Lambda \rightarrow 0$ limit.

is more convenient, particularly for the calculations of the later sections of this paper, so we will adopt it now. The one-loop β -functional and the Fermi velocity anomalous dimensions may be evaluated by this technique and one finds:

$$\beta(g) = -\frac{1}{2}(1 - \gamma_V)g^2 + 4g^2 \quad (3.10)$$

$$\gamma_V = 4 \quad (3.11)$$

where $\epsilon = \frac{g^2 v_F}{(2\pi)^2}$ is the correct expansion parameter for perturbation theory, as may be seen from dimensional analysis. Every divergent loop integral may be reduced to the form $\int \frac{d^2 k_x}{k_x^2}$ which is a dimension $(1 - \gamma_V)=2$ quantity; the product of such a term with ϵ is dimensionless.

4. Curved Fermi Surfaces

When the Fermi surface is circular, one would like to impose the additional requirement of rotational invariance. If k_x, k_y are coordinates about a point on the Fermi surface as in the flat case, then the distance above the Fermi surface is $k_y + k_x^2 = 2k_F$ and hence

$$\beta(k) = \gamma_V (k_y + k_x^2 - 2k_F) \quad (4.1)$$

for k_x, k_y small compared to k_F . To preserve rotational invariance (about the center of the Fermi circle, not about the origin of the k_x, k_y coordinates), the two terms in (4.1) should scale the same way. Hence, we must take $\gamma_V = \frac{1}{2}$ [13,14].

Otherwise, the circular Fermi surface is completely analogous to the flat one. It is quite clear that there is nothing particularly special about circular Fermi surfaces because the important fermion-gauge field interactions occur in the neighborhood of a given point.^z The curvature of the Fermi surface determines the value of γ_V .

^z This implies, as well, that these results apply to the less symmetric Fermi surfaces of real metals.

In particular, the one-loop calculations are nearly identical for flat and curved Fermi surfaces. The presentation of these calculations given in the previous section and in [14] is fairly telegraphic, so in the next section we provide a more detailed and self-contained analysis, specializing to the case of a circular Fermi surface. We also take this opportunity to correct some mistakes and misprints in [14].

5.E Effective Action: Screening and Scaling

We are considering the interacting fermion-Chern-Simons gauge field system with repulsion. As before, we shall insert the constraint derived from varying with respect to a_0 . In this way we arrive at the first six terms of the action we intend to work with:

[illegible]

The last, additional term requires some explanation. It is meant to incorporate the effect of static screening. It is standard practice to include such a term or its equivalent, at least implicitly, both in this context (e.g. [1]) and in the more familiar context of electromagnetism. In the latter context, this term parametrizes the plasmon mass. Two obvious questions it raises are: Why doesn't it violate gauge invariance? and Where does it come from? Let us address these in turn:

Of course, as written, a term $a_0 a_0$ in the action does violate gauge invariance. However, it really arises in the form

$$a_0 a_0 = \bar{f}_{0j} f_{0j} ; \quad (5.2)$$

involving a polarization operator Π . The true polarization operator is a complicated expression, even at one loop (the Lindhard function), but it reduces to a constant times $1/k^2$ at small momenta and frequencies. For our purpose of analyzing the infrared behavior, it suffices to keep only the leading term. Even within this term we can drop the $a_0 a_j$ terms and the cross terms, because they are subdominant according to the power-counting that will presently emerge, at least for $x > 0$.

The screening term emerges from the vacuum polarization graph with the fermions circulating in a loop. Since it is a loop effect, there is some logical inconsistency in treating it as part of the effective action, that we shall then use to generate a perturbation theory (including its own loops ...). However we must include this term from the outset, because although it is formally higher order in the loop expansion or gauge coupling it is the leading term of its type in the infrared. Since its purpose is to remove a singularity at small momenta that really isn't there, i.e. to give the longitudinal part of the gauge field a mass, adding this term helps stabilize the perturbation scheme. In principle for consistency one should, having stabilized the perturbation scheme, treat the difference between the original tree-graph polarization and the assumed one as an interaction, whose effects could be assessed perturbatively. These effects are presumably small, at least if the standard treatment of screening in many-body theory, which seems quite reasonable on physical grounds, is correct. Although we are not aware of a really adequate discussion along these lines, there is of course a vast literature on the subject from other points of view (see [28]) going back to the classic work of Bohm and Pines.

While the treatment of screening within effective field theory is an interesting problem that undoubtedly deserves more attention, we shall not attempt it here. In

the absence of such a treatment we cannot escape some looseness in the derivation of (5.1). It seems to be the simplest straightforward implementation of the standard intuition regarding screening: that the fermions in fact screens, or in other words removes the source at long wavelength (for us, that means setting the Chern-Simons magnetic field equal to the fermion density); and that it generates a plasmon mass. In any case, from this point on we will regard (5.1) as given, and consider the consequences.

Under the scaling,

$$k_x \rightarrow s^{1/2} k_x \quad (5.3)$$

$$k_y \rightarrow s k_y \quad (5.4)$$

$$\rightarrow s; \quad (5.5)$$

the fields and couplings have the following scaling dimensions:

$$[\psi] = \frac{7}{4} \quad (5.6)$$

$$[a_y] = \frac{7}{4} \quad (5.7)$$

$$[a_x] = \frac{9}{4} \quad (5.8)$$

$$[a_0] = \frac{5}{4} \quad (5.9)$$

$$[M_F] = 0 \quad (5.10)$$

$$[g] = \frac{1}{4} \quad (5.11)$$

The scaling of the fermions and the gauge fields is determined by the condition that the first, second, and third terms in (5.1) are left invariant. The fourth term is the

Chern-Simons term which scales as $s^{x=4}$. Although it is irrelevant in a technical sense, it is the leading P, T violating term and is, therefore, important for, e.g. calculations of χ_{xy} in the $\nu = 1/2$ quantum Hall state. The next two terms are the fermion-gauge field interactions (the latter of these is required by gauge invariance in a non-relativistic system). They are irrelevant for $x > 1$, marginal for $x = 1$, and relevant for $x < 1$. The final term is the fermion-scalar potential interaction which is irrelevant since it scales as $s^{1=4}$.

The renormalization functions, Z , Z_{VF} , and Z_g in (5.1) relate the bare and low-energy quantities (μ is an arbitrary energy scale):

$$\psi_0 = Z^{1/2} \psi \quad (5.12)$$

$$V_{F0} = Z_{VF} V_F \quad (5.13)$$

$$g_0 = \frac{1-x}{4} g \frac{Z_g}{Z Z_{VF}} : \quad (5.14)$$

These three functions are sufficient to cancel all of the divergences in correlation functions of fermions and gauge fields.

6. Renormalization Group Equations and Their Solution

One may obtain renormalization group equations for correlation functions in the standard way. Differentiating the relationship between bare and renormalized correlation functions,

$$Z^{n/2} G^{(n)}(\mathbf{r}_i; V_F, \mathbf{r}_i; \mu) = G_0^{(n)}(\mathbf{r}_i; V_F, \mathbf{r}_i; \mu) \quad (6.1)$$

(r is the distance to the Fermi surface, $r = k_y + k_x^2/2k_F$ and μ is the energy scale)

with respect to μ , we find:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} + \beta(\mu) \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} + \frac{n}{2} \beta(\mu) - v_F(\mu) r_i \frac{\partial}{\partial r_i} G^{(n)}(\mu; v_F r_i; \mu; \mu) = 0 \quad (6.2)$$

since the bare correlation functions are independent of μ , where

$$\beta(\mu) = \frac{d}{d\mu} \quad (6.3)$$

$$\beta(\mu) = \frac{d}{d\mu} \ln Z = \beta(\mu) \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} \ln Z \quad (6.4)$$

$$v_F(\mu) = \frac{d}{d\mu} \ln Z_{v_F} = \beta(\mu) \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} \ln Z_{v_F} \quad (6.5)$$

The renormalization group equation, (6.2), has the solution:

$$G^{(n)}(\mu; v_F r_i; \mu; \mu) = \mu^{-\frac{n}{2}} G^{(n)}(\mu; v_F(\mu) r_i; \mu; \mu) \quad (6.6)$$

Combined with the simple scaling property of the Green functions under the scaling, (5.3) – (5.5),

$$G^{(n)}(\mu; v_F r_i; \mu; \mu) = \mu^{\frac{7}{4}n - \frac{5}{2}(n-1)} G^{(n)}(\mu; v_F(\mu) r_i; \mu; \mu) \quad (6.7)$$

this yields

$$G^{(n)}(\mu; v_F r_i; \mu; \mu) = \mu^{\frac{5}{2}(n-1) - \frac{7}{4}n + \frac{n}{2}} G^{(n)}(\mu; v_F(\mu) r_i; \mu; \mu) \quad (6.8)$$

For the two-point function, we may take $n=2$, and we find, at low μ ,

$$G^{(2)}(\mu; v_F r; \mu; \mu) = \mu^{-1+\frac{v_F r}{\mu^{1+v_F}}} G^{(2)}(1; \frac{v_F r}{\mu^{1+v_F}}; \mu; \mu) \quad (6.9)$$

For correlation functions with insertions of a two-fermion operator, O , we have the

renormalization group equation analogous to (6.2):

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial} + \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial} + \frac{n}{2} \right) \left(\right) + 1 \circ \left(\right) - v_F \left(\right) r_i \frac{\partial}{\partial r_i} G^{(n;l)}(i; v_F r_i; j; v_F r_j; ;) = 0 \quad (6.10)$$

where

$$\circ \left(\right) = \frac{d}{d} \ln Z_0 = Z = \left(\right) \frac{\partial}{\partial} \ln Z_0 = Z \quad (6.11)$$

and Z_0 is the counterterm which must be introduced for the renormalization of correlation functions with 0 insertions. The scaling relation which follows from this renormalization group equation, analogous to the scaling relations, (6.8), is:

$$G^{(n;l)}(i; v_F r_i; j; v_F r_j; ;) = \frac{5}{2} (n-1+2l) - \frac{7}{4} (n+2l) - 4 + \frac{n}{2} + 1 \circ G^{(n;l)}(i; v_F r_i; j; v_F r_j; ;) \quad (6.12)$$

At the Fermi liquid fixed point, $\epsilon = 0$, which is stable for $x > 1$ (or, more generically, when there are no gauge fields present), these renormalization group equations have trivial solutions, such as:

$$G^{(2)}(i; v_F r_i; = 0;) = i^{-1} G^{(2)}(1; \frac{v_F r}{i}; 0;) \quad (6.13)$$

$$G^{(0;2)}(i; v_F r_i; = 0;) = G^{(0;2)}(1; \frac{v_F r}{i}; 0;) \quad (6.14)$$

Since ϵ is a relevant coupling for $x < 1$, $\epsilon = 0$ is no longer an infrared stable fixed point. In [14], a new fixed point was found in an expansion in $(1-x)$. An analogy was drawn between static critical phenomena and this system in which $(1-x)$ plays the role of $\epsilon = 4 - d$. The regularization procedure which was used is analogous to dimensional regularization: the pole parts in $(1-x)$ of divergent integrals are cancelled by renormalization counterterms.

7. Calculations and Ward Identity

Following [14], we will calculate the renormalization functions and the resulting β -function by this technique. We will also say a few words about doing the same calculations with a cutoff regulator. Such a calculation will be more in the spirit of the calculations of Halperin, Lee, and Read [1] (and, of course, more in the spirit of the Wilsonian recursion relations which we discussed in the section on flat Fermi surfaces). The zero of the β -function is then found to leading order in $(1-x)$. The anomalous dimensions, γ and γ_{v_F} , which determine the scaling forms of correlation functions of fermion fields, are calculated to the same order. Later, we will also use this method to calculate the anomalous dimensions of composite operators such as the density and current density; these anomalous dimensions appear in the scaling forms of correlation functions with these operators inserted. All of the one-loop diagrams of this theory are displayed in Figure 1. The first two diagrams in Figure 1 are sufficient to determine the renormalization group functions Z , Z_{v_F} , and Z_g . The divergence in the third diagram is related to that in the second by gauge invariance; either one can be used to determine Z_g . The fourth diagram is subleading by a power of the external frequency and gives a contribution to an irrelevant operator, not to one of the terms in the action (5.1). The fifth and sixth diagrams have no singular pieces in $(1-x)$.

The first diagram in Figure 1 is the fermion self-energy diagram. There are contributions coming from the $a_y - a_{\bar{y}}$, $a_x - a_{\bar{x}}$, $a_0 - a_{\bar{0}}$, and $a_0 - a_{\bar{1}}$ propagators. Since there is only one transverse gauge boson in $2+1$ dimensions, one may solve for a_x in terms of a_y . In other words, we should choose a gauge. Here we shall calculate in radiation gauge, $a_x = (\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}_x)a_y$. This gauge is actually somewhat unnatural from the point of view of our scaling (although having reached this point, in calculating graphs we can use any gauge we please). In an Appendix we discuss another, more natural class of gauges, and check explicitly that the anomalous dimensions of interest do not depend upon the gauge choice. In the kinematic region of interest, $q_y^2 = k_F^2$ as enforced by the pole at this value

in the q_y integral (so the $a_x \rightarrow a_x$ propagator is suppressed by a factor of $q_x^2 = k_F^2$ compared to the $a_y \rightarrow a_y$ propagator. The contribution from the $a_0 \rightarrow a_0$ and $a_0 \rightarrow a_x$ propagators, too, are suppressed by powers of q as may be seen directly from the effective Lagrangian, (5.1). Hence, we only need to consider the contribution to the fermion self-energy coming from the $a_y \rightarrow a_y$ propagator.

$$\frac{g^2 v_F^2}{(2\pi)^3} \int d^4 q_x d^4 q_y \frac{1}{q_x^2 - x} \frac{1}{i} \frac{1}{(k - q)} \quad (7.1)$$

The $d^4 q_y$ integral may be done by contour integration since q_y appears linearly in the denominator of the fermion propagator. Then $d^4 q_y$ disappears from the integrand, and the $d^4 q_x$ integral may be done, leaving

$$2! \int \frac{d^4 q_x}{q_x^2 - x} = 4! \frac{1}{1 - x} + \text{finite part} \quad (7.2)$$

where the divergent part of the integral has been evaluated by taking the pole part in $(1 - x)$ in analogy with dimensional regularization. Since the self-energy contribution depends only on 1 , we may conclude that $Z Z_{v_F} = 1$ and:

$$Z = Z_{v_F}^{-1} = 1 - 4 \frac{1}{1 - x} + O(\epsilon^2) : \quad (7.3)$$

The second diagram in Figure 1 is the vertex correction. Again, we need only consider the contribution coming from the exchange of a_y gauge bosons,

$$(g v_F)^2 \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{i(1 + i)} \frac{1}{(p + k) i} \frac{1}{i} \frac{1}{(p - k) k^2 - x} = 2 \int \frac{d^4 k_x}{k_x^2 - x} ; \quad (7.4)$$

where the dk_x and d^4 integrals have been done as in the self-energy integral. Again, the renormalization counterterm is chosen to cancel the pole part in $(1 - x)$,

$$Z_g = 1 - 4 \frac{1}{1 - x} + O(\epsilon^2) : \quad (7.5)$$

Differentiating the equation,

$$0 = \frac{1-x}{2} \frac{Z_g^2}{Z^2 Z_{v_F}} \quad (7.6)$$

with respect to $\ln \mu$, and solving for $\beta(\alpha) = d\alpha/d\ln \mu$, we have $\beta(\alpha)$ in the convenient form :

$$\beta(\alpha) = \frac{1}{2} (1-x) \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} \ln Z_g^2 = (Z^2 Z_{v_F})^{-1} : \quad (7.7)$$

Using (7.3) and (7.5), we find a β -function

$$\beta(\alpha) = \frac{1}{2} (1-x) \alpha^2 + O(\alpha^3) \quad (7.8)$$

and anomalous dimensions,

$$\gamma_{v_F}(\alpha) = \gamma(\alpha) = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} \ln Z_{v_F} \right) = -2 + O(\alpha^2) : \quad (7.9)$$

The physical interpretation of these equations is quite simple. The effective coupling, α , grows at low energies on dimensional grounds but this growth is cut off by quantum fluctuations { i.e. screening } so the coupling approaches a fixed value, $\alpha = (1-x)/4$. Another way to look at this is to observe that, although there is no divergent vacuum polarization, there is a relative renormalization between the space and time parts of the action. This renormalization, which is an important possibility for non-relativistic systems, leads both to the running of the effective coupling and the running of the Fermi velocity. The effective Fermi velocity falls to zero as the Fermi surface is approached,

$$v_F \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \mu \rightarrow \mu_F \quad (7.10)$$

and the quasiparticle weight vanishes with the same exponent,

$$Z \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \mu \rightarrow \mu_F : \quad (7.11)$$

These anomalous dimensions are reflected in the scaling form of the fermion Green

function.

$$G(\mathbf{k}; r) = G(\mathbf{k}; v_F(\mathbf{k})r; \epsilon) = \epsilon^{1+} G\left(1; \frac{v_F r}{\epsilon^{1-j} v_F^j}; \epsilon; 1\right) \quad (7.12)$$

We can compare the calculations (7.1) – (7.5) with the same calculations done with a cutoff regulator. Such a formalism will be useful later when diagrams with exceptional kinematics are considered. As an example, consider the self-energy diagram.

$$\frac{g^2 v_F^2}{(2\epsilon)^3} \int d\mathbf{q}_x d\mathbf{q}_y \frac{1}{q_x^2 + i\epsilon} \frac{1}{(k - \mathbf{q})^2 + i\epsilon} \quad (7.13)$$

Here, we have used the one-loop improved inverse gauge field propagator which includes the effects of Landau damping, as in [1]. (The justification for such a procedure is the same as that for the inclusion of the screening term in the action) The q_y -integral may be done first as before, to yield:

$$\frac{g^2 v_F^2}{(2\epsilon)^2} \int d\mathbf{q}_x \frac{1}{q_x^2 + i\epsilon} \text{sign}(\epsilon) : \quad (7.14)$$

The ϵ -integration then gives:

$$2 \int_0^{\Lambda} d\mathbf{q}_x \frac{1}{i} \ln(q_x^2 + i\epsilon) \quad (7.15)$$

The remaining q_x -integration must be done with a cutoff. We find an ϵ -dependent part (to lowest order in $(1 - x)$):

$$2 \ln(i\epsilon) = \frac{2}{x} \quad (7.16)$$

This implies a wavefunction renormalization given by:

$$Z = 1 - 4 \ln x \quad (7.17)$$

Other diagrams are similar.

Ward Identity: An important identity relating Z and Z_g follows from gauge invariance. The Ward identity following from the conservation of the current is (in real time and position space for convenience)

$$\partial_\mu \langle j^\mu(z) \bar{\psi}(x) \psi(y) \rangle = (z-x) \langle \bar{\psi}(x) \psi(y) \rangle + (z-y) \langle \bar{\psi}(x) \psi(y) \rangle \quad (7.18)$$

This equation relates divergences in the vertex function to those in the fermion two-point function. The divergent contributions to the left-hand-side are cancelled by Z_g while the divergent contributions to the right-hand-side are cancelled by Z . Hence, the equality (7.18) implies that

$$Z = Z_g \quad (7.19)$$

Actually, a little more care is required in a non-relativistic theory. The term $\partial_0 \langle j^0(z) \bar{\psi}(x) \psi(y) \rangle$ has divergences cancelled by Z_g , while the term $\partial_i \langle j^i(z) \bar{\psi}(x) \psi(y) \rangle$ has divergences cancelled by $Z_g Z_{v_F}$ because j_i has an explicit factor of v_F in its definition. Similarly, the fermion propagator on the right-hand-side has an ϵ -dependent piece with renormalization function Z and a term proportional to $v_F k$ with renormalization function $Z Z_{v_F}$. Equating the ϵ - and k -dependent terms separately, we have $Z_g = Z$ and $Z_g Z_{v_F} = Z Z_{v_F}$ which both yield (7.19). Our explicit evaluations respect these identities, as they had better.

8. Renormalization of Composite Operators; Applications

Landau Parameters: The Landau parameters, the central quantities in Landau's Fermi liquid theory, are the marginal four-Fermi couplings $u(k_{1x}; k_{2x}; k_{1x})$ and $u(k_{1x}; k_{2x}; k_{2x})$, as we mentioned earlier. (The Landau parameter couplings are not restricted to the neighborhood of single point where the k_x, k_y coordinates are valid, but this is the only context in which we will be considering them.) If there were no gauge interactions, these couplings would be strictly marginal, i.e. $(u(k_{1x}; k_{2x}; k_{1x})) = (u(k_{1x}; k_{2x}; k_{1x})) = 0$. However, interactions with a transverse gauge field could, in principle, cause them to run.

Consider the simplest case, $u(k_{1x}; k_{2x}; k_{1x}) = u_0$, and introduce a renormalization counterterm Z_u for this coupling.

$$u_0 = u Z_u = Z^2 \quad (8.1)$$

Z_u may be calculated from the diagrams in Figure 2. One sees, by inspection that $(Z_u - 1) = 2(Z_g - 1)$. But then, we immediately have $Z_u = Z^2 = 1$ to lowest order. As a result, the Landau parameters do not scale.

In principle, the fact that they are marginal means that the interactions parametrized by the Landau parameters should be included in the effective action. However, they do not contribute to the renormalization of other couplings, at least to one-loop order, because of their restricted kinematics. Indeed because they merely exchange (or, in three dimensions, rotate) momenta they cannot link low-momentum to high-momentum modes directly. At higher orders they would occur, through their influence on the interactions among virtual high-momentum modes. Thus they do not affect our calculations, to the order we performed them.

Cooper Pairing and the $2k_F$ Vertex. The diagram which determines the one-loop χ -function of the (marginal) Cooper pairing interaction (which scatters electrons of momentum p ; $-p$ to momentum k ; $-k$) is displayed in Figure 3. This diagram causes an attractive Cooper pairing interaction to grow logarithmically, while a repulsive one is driven logarithmically to zero. In the presence of a gauge field, the second diagram in Figure 3 also appears at one-loop. This diagram is unlike the usual Cooper pairing diagram and unlike the other diagrams which we considered earlier in that it gives a $(\ln)^2$ rather than a simple \ln contribution. For this reason, this diagram must be handled with a little extra care. We will use a variant of the cutoff regularization that we discussed earlier.

As a warm-up, let us do the Cooper pairing diagram of Fermi liquid theory (the first diagram in Figure 3). Here and in the gauge field case to follow, we will take the simplest case of an $l = 0$ Cooper pairing interaction, $V(k; k^0) = V$.

We will introduce a frequency cut-off, but q_y is unrestricted as before; q_x is also unrestricted. The q_y integration may be done immediately to yield:

$$\begin{aligned} V^2 \int_0^Z dq_x dq_y \frac{1}{i(\omega - \epsilon_k)} \frac{1}{(k + q)(\omega + \epsilon_{k+q})} &= \frac{V^2}{V_F} \int_0^Z dq_x \frac{d}{d\omega} \left(\frac{1}{(\omega - \epsilon_k)} - \frac{1}{(\omega + \epsilon_{k+q})} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (8.2)$$

The q_x -integral is a harmless angular integral, and the ω -integral gives:

$$\frac{V^2}{V_F} \ln \left(\frac{\omega + \epsilon_{k+q}}{\omega - \epsilon_k} \right) \quad (8.3)$$

With the gauge field, we will use a cut-off regulator and introduce cut-offs for both ω and q . As usual, we do the q_y -integral first:

$$\begin{aligned} (gv_F)^2 V \int_0^Z dq_x dq_y \frac{1}{i(\omega - \epsilon_k)} \frac{1}{(k + q)(\omega + \epsilon_{k+q})} \frac{1}{(k + q)^2 x + i j(\omega + \epsilon_{k+q})} &= V \int_0^Z dq_x \frac{d}{d\omega} \frac{1}{q^2 x + i j(\omega + \epsilon_{k+q})} \left(\frac{1}{(\omega - \epsilon_k)} - \frac{1}{(\omega + \epsilon_{k+q})} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (8.4)$$

The q_x -integral may be done up to the cut-off giving:

$$V \int_0^Z \frac{d}{d\omega} \ln \left(\frac{\omega^2 + i j(\omega + \epsilon_{k+q})}{\omega^2 + i j(\omega - \epsilon_k)} \right) \ln \left(\frac{\omega + \epsilon_{k+q}}{\omega - \epsilon_k} \right) \quad (8.5)$$

The ω -integral then gives

$$\begin{aligned} V \int_0^Z \frac{d}{d\omega} \ln \left(\frac{\omega^2 + i j(\omega + \epsilon_{k+q})}{\omega^2 + i j(\omega - \epsilon_k)} \right) \ln \left(\frac{\omega + \epsilon_{k+q}}{\omega - \epsilon_k} \right) &= V \left((i j = \frac{2}{x}; 2; 1) - (i j(\omega + \epsilon_{k+q}) = \frac{2}{x}; 2; 1) + (\ln \omega)^2 - (\ln(\omega + \epsilon_{k+q}))^2 \right) \end{aligned} \quad (8.6)$$

The presence of a $(\ln \omega)^2$ term indicates divergent behavior in both the ultraviolet and the infrared. If we hold the ω_x cut-off constant, and vary the ω cut-off, then the coupling V is driven to zero as $e^{-(\ln \omega)^2}$.

A very similar effect occurs in the renormalization of the $2k_F$ vertex. This vertex is important because of its contribution to the $2k_F$ density-density correlation function and its role in the calculation of the effects of a quenched random distribution of impurities. Consider the diagram in Figure 4 where the external fermion lines have low energy and distance from the Fermi surface but differ by $2k_F$. Integrating p_y as above, we find an integral of precisely the same form as (8.4) above.

$$\begin{aligned}
 (gv_F)^2 \int_0^Z dp_x dp_y & \frac{1}{i(\epsilon + \frac{1}{Z})} \frac{1}{(k - p + 2k)(\epsilon + \frac{1}{Z})} \frac{1}{(k - p^2 + i j - p j)} \\
 & = \int_0^Z dp_x \frac{1}{\epsilon + 2\frac{1}{Z} p^2 + i j - p j} (\text{sign}(\epsilon + \frac{1}{Z}) - \text{sign}(\epsilon + \frac{1}{Z}))
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{8.7}$$

As before, this will have the $(\ln Z)^2$ form.

Impurity Scattering. Scattering by isolated impurities is also marginal in Fermi liquid theory. If the impurity is non-magnetic and interacts only through ordinary potential scattering, the β -function for the electron-impurity coupling vanishes to all orders in the absence of gauge interactions.[?] To see this, examine the first diagram in Figure 5 which could, potentially, renormalize impurity scattering in Fermi liquid theory. The Landau parameter interactions can only permute the incoming momenta (or rotate them, in $d = 3$), so the loop momenta are completely constrained. As a result, the diagrams are non-divergent and vanish if the internal momenta are restricted to a thin shell at the cutoff. Hence, these diagrams do not cause the electron-impurity coupling to run although they may be numerically important, since they can result in large corrections. The second diagram in Figure 5 is unique to the non-Fermi liquid theory with gauge interactions.

Let the electron-impurity coupling be represented by the following term in the effective Lagrangian (we consider the simplest case of rotationally invariant scat-

? If the impurity is magnetic and interacts through spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ scattering, then the β -function for the electron-impurity coupling receives a non-vanishing contribution from loop effects. Such a system is the subject of the Kondo model.

tering),

$$Z \int d^2k_1 d^2k_2 Z^{-1} \chi(k_2;!) \chi(k_1;!) : \quad (8.8)$$

As in the case of the Landau parameters, we see by inspection that $Z = Z_g$, so impurity scattering also does not run. This is essentially because a single impurity couples to the local density which is not renormalized as a result of the Ward identity. However, a quenched random distribution of impurities may be thought of as coupling to a $2k_F$ correlation function, which is renormalized. This could have observable consequences for localization in the $\nu = 1/2$ quantum Hall system.

Other Composite Operators: The renormalization functions Z , Z_{v_F} , and Z_g are not sufficient to cancel the divergences which arise in correlation functions with composite operator insertions. To calculate, for instance, the density-density correlation function, we must introduce the renormalization function Z_ρ . The anomalous dimension, obtained from this renormalization function may be substituted into the solution (6.12) of the renormalization group equation (6.10) to give the scaling form:

$$\chi(q;!) \chi(q;!) i^{-2} f\left(1; \frac{v_F r}{1 - j_{v_F} j}\right) \quad (8.9)$$

However, the anomalous dimensions of ρ vanish, $\gamma_\rho = 0$ as a result of the Ward identity, (7.18), so the scaling form is the same as that of Fermi liquid theory. It also follows from the Ward identity that the current receives the anomalous dimensions of the Fermi velocity, so

$$\chi_j(q;!) \chi_j(q;!) i^{-2} f_j\left(1; \frac{v_F r}{1 - j_{v_F} j}\right) = v_F^{-2} f_j\left(1; \frac{v_F r}{1 - j_{v_F} j}\right) \quad (8.10)$$

By similar arguments, the heat current, j_Q , which has an extra factor of $v_F k$ compared to j , has anomalous dimensions $\gamma_{j_Q} = -2_{v_F}$.

Logarithmic Corrections at $x = 1$: At $x = 1$, the interaction is marginal and the fixed point coupling is $g^* = 0$. All anomalous dimensions vanish, but scaling laws

receive logarithmic corrections. These may be calculated by directly integrating the one-loop β -function:

$$\frac{d}{d \ln} = \gamma(\epsilon) = 2\epsilon^2 \quad (8.11)$$

which gives, at low energies:

$$= \frac{1}{2 \ln \frac{\omega}{\omega_0}} \quad (8.12)$$

This may be substituted into

$$\frac{d \ln v_F}{d \ln} = \gamma_{v_F} = 2 \quad (8.13)$$

(obtained by differentiating (5.13)) and the resulting equation may be integrated to give:

$$v_F(\epsilon) = \frac{v_{F0}}{\ln \frac{\omega}{\omega_0}} \quad (8.14)$$

Logarithmic corrections to the scaling of composite operators may be obtained similarly.

9. Equilibrium and Transport Properties

The invariance of the effective Lagrangian under our scaling, together with the one-loop calculation of renormalization functions, may be used to write the scaling form of the free energy. The temperature dependence is determined by finite-size scaling, where the inverse temperature, β , is the "size" in the time direction. The equilibrium properties of a metal described by this fixed point follow immediately from differentiation of the free energy. The transport coefficients are given, according to the Kubo formulas, by correlation functions of density and current operators. These may be calculated from the renormalization group equations appropriate to correlation functions with composite operator insertions. Again, the anomalous dimensions associated with these are restricted by the Ward identities resulting

from gauge invariance. The calculation of these quantities using renormalization group methods is explained in [15].

Equilibrium properties: The scaling form for the free energy density is

$$f = \text{const.} + \frac{k_F^{d-1} Q(v_F^{-\nu_F}; \dots)}{2} \quad (9.1)$$

Since the free energy density for any theory with a Fermi surface is proportional to k_F^{d-1} , the 2 in the denominator is given by dimensional analysis. Q is a function of all of the couplings, but these may, in general, be set equal to their fixed point values (which is zero for most of them). There is one exception, however: v_F can not be set equal to its fixed point value, namely zero. When $v_F = 0$ and k_F is held constant, the energy of fermionic excitations vanishes, so the free energy diverges. That is, v_F is a dangerous irrelevant parameter. As a result, we cannot take

$$f = \text{const.} + \frac{k_F^{d-1} Q(0; u_1; u_2; \dots)}{2} \quad (9.2)$$

but must, rather, take

$$f = \text{const.} + \frac{k_F^{d-1}}{2} \frac{A}{v_F^{-\nu_F}} \quad (9.3)$$

where $Q(v_F^{-\nu_F}; u_1; \dots) = A(v_F^{-\nu_F})$.

The specific heat, $C_V = T \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial T^2}$ follows:

$$C_V = T^{1-\nu_F} \tilde{C} \quad (9.4)$$

To derive the compressibility and magnetic susceptibility, the scaling form (9.1) must be generalized to include the possibility of a variable chemical potential and

magnetic field:

$$f = \text{const} + \frac{1}{2} k_F^{d-1} Q(v_F; \mu; H; \dots) \quad (9.5)$$

Then, the compressibility is given by

$$\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial \mu^2} \propto T^2 \quad (9.6)$$

and the (spin) magnetic susceptibility by

$$\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial H^2} \propto T^2 \quad (9.7)$$

(For the orbital magnetic susceptibility, replace μ with μ_B). The compressibility and susceptibility may also be calculated from the $\mu \rightarrow 0$ limit of the density-density and spin-spin correlation functions.

Transport Properties: The conductivity is given, according to the Kubo formula, by:

$$\lim_{\omega \rightarrow 0} \frac{d}{d\omega} \text{Im} \chi(q=0; \omega) \propto \chi(q=0; \omega=0) \quad (9.8)$$

Naively applying the scaling formula (8.10), we find

$$\text{Im} \chi(q=0; \omega) \propto \chi(q=0; \omega=0) \propto T^{2-d} f_j(T; 0) \quad (9.9)$$

However, as was pointed out in [15], more care is required because of the presence of the dimensionful parameter, k_F . The correct scaling law is:

$$\text{Im} \chi(q=0; \omega) \propto \chi(q=0; \omega=0) \propto \frac{k_F}{T} T^{2-d} f_j(T; 0) \quad (9.10)$$

unless there is an umklapp process that is relevant, in which case $k_F = T$ is replaced by $k_F = (g^2 = k_F^2) = (k_F = g)^2$ where g is the reciprocal lattice vector in question. The

conductivity scaling law that follows from (9.10) is:

$$\frac{1}{T^{2-2j_{v_F}j}} \quad (9.11)$$

The thermal conductivity is given by the following combination of correlation functions:

$$K = \frac{1}{T^2} L^{22} - \frac{(L^{12})^2}{L^{11}} \quad (9.12)$$

where

$$L^{11} = T \lim_{\omega \rightarrow 0} \frac{d}{d\omega} \langle j(q=0; \omega) j(q=0; -\omega) \rangle \quad (9.13)$$

$$L^{12} = T \lim_{\omega \rightarrow 0} \frac{d}{d\omega} \langle j_2(q=0; \omega) j(q=0; -\omega) \rangle \quad (9.14)$$

$$L^{22} = T \lim_{\omega \rightarrow 0} \frac{d}{d\omega} \langle j_2(q=0; \omega) j_2(q=0; -\omega) \rangle \quad (9.15)$$

Hence,

$$K \propto T^{1-2j_{v_F}j} \quad (9.16)$$

10. Ballistic Propagation and a Direct Measure of Effective Mass

In a beautiful experiment Goldman, Su, and Jain [2] studied the ballistic propagation of quasiparticles near half filling. Exactly at half filling the quasiparticles are supposed to travel in straight lines, even though they are electrically charged and subject to a large magnetic field, according to the theory of Halperin, Lee, and Read [1]. The mutual interactions among the quasiparticles through the statistical gauge field is supposed to cancel the applied electromagnetic background field, as discussed in the first paragraph above. When the magnetic field is close to but not equal to that which gives half filling, the quasiparticles will feel the difference as an effective field, and move in cyclotron orbits. The effective field can be much

smaller than the real magnetic field, so that the "internal structure" of the quasiparticles, which exists on a scale of the actual magnetic length, is relatively small, and one can in a useful approximation regard them as point particles. Furthermore they obey Fermi statistics, and one begins to analyze them by assuming a Fermi surface as a first approximation, as we have discussed at length above. Goldman, Su, and Jain demonstrated that these ideas are at least roughly valid, by exciting the electron liquid at one point and finding enhanced response at the position of cyclotron orbits corresponding to momentum $k_F = 2^p \frac{\pi}{L}$, that is circles of radius $r = k_F = eB_e$, where $B_e = B / \phi_0$ ($\phi_0 = e$) (in units with $\hbar = 1$.)

On closer analysis, according to the ideas discussed above, quasiparticle properties, and not only occupation numbers, are determined relative to the nominal Fermi surface. In particular, the effective mass diverges, and the velocity along a cyclotron orbit vanishes as its inverse, as the momentum approaches the nominal Fermi surface. The technique of Goldman, Su, and Jain allows one to translate this momentum-space structure into real space. By further measuring the time of flight along the orbits, as a function of their radius, one could therefore in principle check the most characteristic feature of the non-Fermi liquid fixed point, that is the divergence of the effective mass at the nominal Fermi surface, rather directly.

11. The Distinction Between Quasiparticles and Electrons

Until now, we have had very little to say about the electrons in the $\nu = 1/2$ quantum Hall effect. The reason for this is that the description in terms of quasiparticles is very simple { essentially that of Fermi liquid theory with logarithmic corrections { while the electrons are a complicated bound state of a quasiparticle and two flux tubes. One might worry that experimental probes couple directly to electrons rather than to quasiparticles. However, for the physical properties considered in Sections 8 and 9, it is sufficient to consider the quasiparticles. For thermodynamic properties this is simply because the quasiparticles are the actual low-lying excitations, and for probes that couple to (collective gauge neutral)

fermion bilinears such as the current, energy, or density the distinction between the quasiparticle fields and the electron, which differ by a singular gauge transformation, is unimportant.

However, there are some experiments for which the single-particle properties of electrons are important, and in the course of acknowledging their existence we will make a few brief comments at this point, that we realize are very far from exhausting the subject.

The distinction between quasiparticles and electrons is fundamental when one considers coupling the non-Fermi liquid to the outside world, as in tunneling. For the outside world will not accept quasiparticles, but only electrons. The electron spectral weight, or imaginary part of the retarded electron Green function, is the relevant quantity for the calculation of the tunneling current. He, Platzman, and Halperin [29] have calculated the electron Green function by assuming that an additional electron added to a $\nu = 1/2$ state may be treated as an infinitely massive charged particle that undergoes no recoil (much like the core hole in the X-ray edge effect) and then using the well known results of the X-ray edge problem. They justified this treatment of the electron by appealing to the effects of the large magnetic field. They found that the electron spectral weight is exponentially suppressed at low frequency, going as $e^{-\nu_0 \hbar \omega}$. As a result, the tunneling current goes as $e^{-\nu_0 \hbar V}$ at small voltage. Kim and Wen [30] have found qualitatively similar results (but not exactly the same; their ν_0 differs from that of He, et al. by a factor of 2) using semiclassical techniques. A classical 'instanton' solution corresponding to the creation of a quasiparticle together with two flux tubes was found. The Green function was then found from the Euclidean action for the instanton-anti-instanton process corresponding to the creation and annihilation of an electron. The action for creating an electron for time τ goes as $\tau^{1/2}$. This

? The 2+1-dimensional spacetime may be thought of as a three-dimensional space and the instanton-anti-instanton pair may be thought of as a monopole-antimonopole pair. The action $\tau^{1/2}$ may be thought of as an energy cost $E \sim L^{1/2}$ for creating a monopole-antimonopole pair separated by a distance L . Such an energy cost would conserve monopoles, but more weakly than the usual $E \sim L$.

action cost for creating an electron alone implies that electrons are bound to flux tubes { so quasiparticles are stable against breaking up into an electron and two flux tubes { but only weakly since the cost is $\propto 1=2$. Running of the coupling will alter these calculations quantitatively, if there is a non-trivial fixed point, and perhaps qualitatively if the fixed point is at zero coupling. This subject deserves further investigation.

One can speculate on the possible relevance of the flux binding for interpreting an interesting class of "effective mass" measurements (different from, although not unrelated to, the ones discussed in the previous section.) We refer to observations of Shubnikov-de Haas oscillations for small $B = B_{1/2}$, analogous to more familiar such measurements on ordinary charged Fermi liquids at small B . If electrons were infinitely strongly bound to flux tubes, one would expect to find a constant effective mass as in the Fermi liquid case. If electrons were not bound to flux tubes at all, as in the case of non-interacting charged particles at half-filling, one would not expect any oscillatory behavior as a function of $(B)^{-1}$ and hence no effective mass. For electrons that are weakly bound to flux tubes, one might expect oscillations in $(B)^{-1}$ but an effective mass with a more interesting asymptotic behavior as $B \rightarrow 0$ rather than the constant behavior of a Fermi liquid near $B = 0$. In recent experiments [12] such oscillations have been observed, and if these experiments are taken at face value it appears that the effective mass diverges as a rather strong power law in B . For several reasons, and especially because the measurements have not been taken very near $B = 0$ where (according to our considerations) the relatively simple asymptotic behavior applies, it may be premature to attempt to fit these experiments. At weak coupling { as we have at $x = 1$ and small B { one would expect a naive analysis to be correct, and it results in a logarithmic correction to the effective mass. If this differs from observations, it might mean that the theory is fundamentally flawed, or (perhaps most plausibly) it might indicate that the experiments have not yet reached the weak-coupling regime, or it might indicate that nonperturbative effects, of which instantons are an example, become quantitatively important even at a relatively

weak coupling. This subject too deserves further investigation.

12. Relation to Other Work; and Concluding Remark

A number of other authors have considered theories of gauge fields interacting with fermionic excitations about a Fermi surface. Inspired by the suggestions of Anderson and collaborators [31] that spin-charge separation occurs in the copper-oxides, several authors [32] have considered theories of fermionic spinons interacting with a gauge field which serves to eliminate the redundancy in the spinon-holon description. At the one-loop level they found non-Fermi liquid behavior, but in the early papers it was quite unclear how the approximations were being controlled. Meanwhile, Halperin, Lee, and Read [1] considered the $\nu = 1/2$ compressible Hall state of electrons interacting through an interaction, $V(q) = \frac{1}{q^x}$, and made it quite plausible that it was described by a gauge theory similar to that proposed for the copper-oxide superconductors. Calculating the one-loop correction to the fermion propagator, they found non-Fermi liquid behavior which depended on the exponent x ; at the physical value, $x = 1$ (Coulomb interaction) they found logarithmic corrections to Fermi liquid theory.

The first attempt to justify the results of low-order perturbation theory from a scaling standpoint was made by Polchinski [13], who invoked a large- N approximation and assumed the validity of the analogue of Migdal's theorem (that there is no significant renormalization of the phonon-electron vertex function) in this context. Here N is the number of fermion species; of course one is ultimately interested in small finite values of N . Recently, Altshuler, Iosevich, and Millis [16] have expanded on this large N analysis. Also important in this regard is the work of Kim, Furusaki, Wen, and Lee [17], who showed that the density-density correlation function is reliably given in perturbation theory because it receives no divergent corrections. Varmma [20] has shown that the case $x = 0$ is marginal in $d = 3$ under a scaling analogous to that presented here and has considered a $(3-d)$ -expansion that is similar in spirit to the $(1-x)$ -expansion presented here.

In this paper, we have elaborated upon the analysis of [14], where it was shown that the control parameter x , introduced by Halperin, Lee, and Read [1], could be used to find a fixed point in a $(1-x)$ -expansion analogous to the ϵ -expansion of critical phenomena. No evidence was found in [14] for the validity of the analogue of Migdal's theorem in the large- N limit. Indeed, because the fixed point coupling, g^* , is proportional to N , all orders in ϵ in the β -function scale as the same power of N near the fixed point. From our perspective, the neglect of higher order corrections is only justified by the smallness of the parameter $(1-x)$. Where this parameter is small, our results essentially agree with those of Halperin, et al. [1], and Altschuler, et al. [16] (in the sense that our renormalization-group expressions, expanded in perturbation theory, agree to the appropriate order with their expressions). The temperature dependence of important physical properties of systems in this universality class is determined by the anomalous dimensions acquired by the Fermi velocity and by two-fermion composite operators. The anomalous dimensions of these operators are constrained by the Ward identities resulting from gauge invariance, and in particular, the density operator receives no anomalous dimensions. Thus we also see no conflict with the main substantive claim of Kohn, et al. [17]. However, we cannot justify, within our framework, more general claims about the validity of various resummations of perturbation theory [16] (or perturbation theory itself [17]) when $1-x$ is not small. For this regime one needs more powerful techniques { possibly those suggested by these authors, or possibly, as we have suggested, ones more analogous to those used in extrapolating the ϵ -expansion in critical phenomena to $\epsilon = 1$.

There have also been some authors who have found radically different behavior from that reported here or found by the above authors. Kwon, et al. [19] and Altschuler, et al. [18] have used bosonization techniques and found Green functions equivalent to those of a one-dimensional model with a four-Fermi coupling that is non-local in time. Kveschenko and Stamp [21] have found similar results using an eikonal approximation. Altschuler, Ioe, and Millis [16] claim that these results are appropriate to the $N \rightarrow 0$ limit, but are not valid for finite N . From our point

of view, it is difficult to see how a bosonization procedure analogous to the one appropriate in $1+1$ dimensions, which maps the interacting fermion Lagrangian onto a quadratic boson action, could be equivalent to our analysis which appears, on the face of it, to be intrinsically higher-dimensional.

If the ideas discussed in this paper correspond to reality, Nature has presented us with a truly remarkable condensed matter system, in which one finds gauge fields, a running coupling constant, and even a version of asymptotic freedom. One virtue of this situation is that it allows one, in principle, to extract precise predictions with controlled estimates of the errors; we have attempted here to provide formal tools to begin this process.

Acknowledgements: We acknowledge the hospitality of the Harvard University physics department where this manuscript was completed.

APPENDIX

Calculations in Other Gauges

The calculations of section 7 were done in radiation gauge, which is particularly simple for calculations, but is not very natural from the point of view of the scaling (5.3) – (5.11). We can, instead, do the calculations in the class of gauges

$$k_x a_y + k_y a_x = 0 \quad (\text{A } 1)$$

which are natural because both terms scale the same way. In this gauge, the gauge field propagator has an additional factor $(1 + \epsilon^2)^{-1}$ and the vertex has an additional factor $1 + \epsilon^2$. As a result, we now find that the β -function is:

$$\beta(\epsilon) = -\frac{1}{2}(1 - \epsilon^2) + 2\frac{(1 + \epsilon^2)}{(1 + \epsilon^2)^2} \epsilon^2 + O(\epsilon^3) \quad (\text{A } 2)$$

and the anomalous dimensions are:

$$\gamma_F(\epsilon) = \gamma_A(\epsilon) = \frac{2(1 + \epsilon^2)}{(1 + \epsilon^2)^2} \epsilon^2 + O(\epsilon^2) : \quad (\text{A } 3)$$

but the anomalous dimensions at the fixed point are still

$$\gamma_F(\epsilon^*) = \gamma_A(\epsilon^*) = -\frac{1}{2}(1 - \epsilon^*) \quad (\text{A } 4)$$

REFERENCES

1. B. Halperin, P. Lee, and N. Read, *Phys. Rev. B* 47 (1993) 7312.
2. R. Willet, M. Paalanen, R. Ruel, K. West, L. Pfeier, and R. Bishop, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 65 (1990) 112; R. Du, H. Stormer, D. Tsui, L. Pfeier, and K. West, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 70 (1993) 2994; R. Du, H. Stormer, D. Tsui, L. Pfeier, and K. West, *Solid State Comm.* 90 (1994) 71 and references therein; D. Leadley, R. Nicholas, C. Foxon, and J. Harris, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 72 (1994) 1906; V. Goldman, B. Su, and J. Jain, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 72 (1994) 2065.
3. D. Aronov, R. Schrieffer, F. Wilczek, and A. Zee, *Nuclear Physics B* 251 (1985) 117; see especially p. 123.
4. R. Laughlin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 60 (1988) 2677; *Science* 242 (1988) 525; A. Fetter, C. Hanna, and R. Laughlin, *Phys. Rev. B* 39 (1989) 9679.
5. Y. Chen, F. Wilczek, E. Witten, and B. Halperin, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. B* 3 (1989) 1001.
6. J. Leinaas and J. Myrheim, *Nuovo Cimento* 37B (1977) 1; G. Goldin, R. Meniko, and D. Sharp, *J. Math. Phys.* 22 (1981) 1664; F. Wilczek, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 48 (1982); *ibid.* 49 (1982) 957.
7. F. Wilczek, A. Zee, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 51 (1982) 2250; see also the discussion and several of the reprints in F. Wilczek, ed. *Fractional Statistics and Anyon Superconductivity* (World Scientific, Singapore 1990); and in addition especially S. Zhang, H. Hanson, and S. Kivelson *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 62 (1989) 82; *ibid.* 980.
8. J. Jain, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 63 (1989) 199; *Phys. Rev. B* 40 (1989) 8079; *B* 41 (1990) 7653.
9. F. Wilczek, in *Fractional Statistics and Anyon Superconductivity*, *ibid.* pp. 80-88; M. Greiter and F. Wilczek, *Mod. Phys. Lett. B* 4 (1990) 1063.

10. E. Abrahams, Beyond the Fermi Liquid Rutgers preprint (unpublished, 1993).
11. C. Varna, Theoretical Framework for the Normal State of Copper-Oxide Metals Bell preprint, to appear Los Alamos Symposium on Strong Correlations, 1993, ed. K. Bedell et. al. (Addison-Wesley 1994).
12. R. Du, H. Stormer, D. Tsui, A. Yeh, L. Pfeiffer, and K. West, Drastic Enhancement of Composite Fermion Mass Near Landau Level Filling $\nu = 1/2$, MIT-Bell Labs-Princeton preprint (unpublished, 1994).
13. J. Polchinski, Low-Energy Dynamics of the Spinon-Gauge System ITP preprint NSF-ITP-93-33 (1993)
14. C. Nayak and F. Wilczek, Nucl. Phys. B 417 (1994) 359.
15. C. Nayak and F. Wilczek, Physical Properties of Metals from a Renormalization Group Standpoint, PUPT 1488, IAS 94/60.
16. B.L. Altshuler, L.B. Ioffe, and A.J. Millis, On the Low Energy Properties of Fermions with Singular Interactions MIT-Rutgers-Bell Labs preprint (unpublished, 1994).
17. Y.B. Kim, Furusaki, X.-G. Wen, and P.A. Lee, Gauge-Invariant Response Functions of Fermions Coupled to a Gauge Field MIT preprint (unpublished, 1994).
18. L.B. Ioffe, D. Lidsky, and B.L. Altshuler Rutgers-MIT preprint (unpublished, 1994).
19. H.J. Kwon, A. Houghton, and J.B. Marston Gauge Interactions and Bosonized Fermi Liquids Brown preprint (unpublished, 1994).
20. C. Varna Theory of the Copper-Oxide Metals Bell reprint (unpublished, 1994).
21. D.V. Khveschenko and P.C.E. Stamp, Phys. Rev. Lett. 71, (1993) 2118.
22. R. Shankar, Physica A 177 (1991) 530; Rev. Mod. Phys. 68 (1994) 129.

23. J. Polchinski, "Effective Field Theory and the Fermi Surface," Proceedings of the 1992 Theoretical Advanced Study Institute in Elementary Particle Physics, ed. J. Harvey and J. Polchinski (World Scientific, Singapore, 1993).
24. G. Benfatto and G. Gallavotti, J. Stat. Phys. 59 (1990) 541; Phys. Rev. B 42 (1990) 9967.
25. As reviewed in S. Ma, Modern Theory of Critical Phenomena, (Benjamin, Reading Mass. 1976).
26. F. D. M. Haldane, J. Phys. C 14 (1981) 2585.
27. Reviewed in X.-G. Wen, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B 6 (1992) 1711.
28. Reviewed in G. Mahan, Many Body Physics (Plenum, New York 1981).
For a modern treatment, with new insights, see A. Houghton, H. Kwon, J. Marston, and R. Shankar, Coulomb Interaction and the Fermi Liquid State: Solution by Bosonization Brown preprint (1994) (to appear in J. Phys. C: Condensed Matter).
29. S. He, P. M. Platzman, and B. I. Halperin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 69 (1992) 3804.
30. Y. B. Kim and X.-G. Wen, Instantons and the spectral function of electrons in the half-filled Landau level M II preprint 1994
31. G. Baskaran and P. Anderson, Phys. Rev. B 37 (1988) 580; P. Anderson, Phys. Rev. Lett. 64 (1990) 1839.
32. See especially P. Lee and N. Nagaosa, Phys. Rev. B 46 (1992) 5621.