

# Two particle correlations and orthogonality catastrophe in interacting Fermi systems

Walter Metzner

Institut für Theoretische Physik C, Technische Hochschule Aachen,  
D-52056 Aachen, Germany

and

Claudio Castellani

Dipartimento di Fisica, Università "La Sapienza", P.le A. Moro 2,  
00185 Roma, Italy

December 31, 2021

## Abstract

The wavefunction of two fermions, repulsively interacting in the presence of a Fermi sea, is evaluated in detail. We consider large but finite systems in order to obtain an unambiguous picture of the two-particle correlations. As recently pointed out by Anderson, in  $d = 2$  dimensions the particles may be correlated even when situated on the Fermi surface. The "partial exclusion principle" for two particles with opposite spin on the same Fermi point is discussed, and related to results from the T-matrix approximation. Particles on different Fermi points are shown to be uncorrelated in  $d > 1$ . Using the results for the two-particle correlations we find that the orthogonality effect induced by adding an extra particle to a (tentative) two-dimensional Fermi liquid is finite.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Several years after Anderson [1] conjectured the failure of Fermi liquid theory in two-dimensional interacting electron systems even at weak coupling, the issue is still rather controversial. Many body perturbation theory says that Fermi liquid theory breaks down only in 1D, while it seems valid in any higher dimension, at least at weak coupling.[2] However, the wavefunction for two interacting particles in the presence of a Fermi sea exhibits a peculiar and at first sight alarming feature, namely a finite phase shift for two particles with opposite spin sitting on the same point of the Fermi surface.[1] A finite phase shift signals the presence of correlations in the two-particle wave function, which seems at odds with the existence of independent and stable quasi particles. This effect is present at arbitrarily weak coupling in 2D. Anderson [1] indeed argued that due to the finite phase shift the insertion of an extra particle in a 2D Fermi system causes an orthogonality catastrophe, making the quasi particle weight vanish, and leading to Luttinger instead of Fermi liquid behavior.

Within conventional many body theory the phase shift is blurred in the thermodynamic limit by coarse-graining momentum space, and does not seem to have any drastic consequences. However, the perturbative many body formalism may be inadequate when singular correlations in momentum space appear. Taking the thermodynamic limit before solving the interacting problem is dangerous in this case. To obtain an unambiguous picture of the correlations associated with the finite phase shift and its possible consequences, it is therefore worthwhile to go back to Schrodinger's equation, and analyse the structure of wave functions in large finite systems.

In this work we present a detailed analysis of the correlations between two locally interacting particles in the presence of a Fermi sea, in one, two and three dimensions, extending earlier studies by Anderson [1] and by Stamp.[3] In Sec. 2 we provide some basic definitions and concepts useful for a clear discussion of large finite systems. In Sec. 3 we solve the two-particle Schrodinger equation, and discuss in detail how the wave functions are affected by the interaction. A careful derivation of Anderson's "partial exclusion principle" [1] for two particles on common Fermi points will be given, and the controversial relation between "phase shift" and "phase angle" [4, 5] will be clarified. Particles on different Fermi points are shown to be uncorrelated in  $d > 1$ . In Sec. 4 we will show that the orthogonality effect induced by adding an extra particle on the Fermi surface of a (tentative) Fermi liquid is finite in any dimension above one. Hence, in higher dimensions a breakdown of Fermi liquid theory, if any, must be more subtle than in 1D. Finally, in Sec. 5, we will conclude with a few remarks on the possibility of hitherto undetected non-perturbative phenomena at weak coupling.

## 2. LARGE FINITE SYSTEMS

Our aim is to take the large system limit only after having understood the effects of interactions. It is therefore necessary to define all quantities appearing in the course of the calculation for finite systems, and introduce certain distinctions which are usually not made in the infinite volume limit.

For definiteness we consider a one-band Hubbard model on a  $d$ -dimensional simple cubic lattice with lattice constant one and periodic boundary conditions. The Hilbert space of states may be spanned by antisymmetrized products of local single particle states  $c_j^\nu |i\rangle$ , where  $c_j^\nu$  creates a fermion with spin projection  $\nu$  on site  $j$  and  $|i\rangle$  is the vacuum. Alternatively one may construct a basis from states with sharp momentum  $|k\rangle = a_k^\nu |i\rangle$ , where  $a_k^\nu = V^{-1/2} \sum_j e^{ikj} c_j^\nu$ , and  $V = L^d$  is the number of lattice sites. We assume  $L$  to be even. The momenta  $k$  are taken from the Brillouin zone  $B = \{k = (k_1; \dots; k_d) : k = (L/2 + 1; L/2 + 2; \dots; L/2) \frac{2}{L}g\}$ , which forms a lattice with  $V$  sites and lattice constant  $2/L$ . The Hamiltonian is

$$H = H_0 + H_I = \sum_{ij} t_{ij} c_i^\nu c_j^\nu + U \sum_j n_j^\uparrow n_j^\downarrow \quad (2.1)$$

where  $t_{ij}$  is a (translation invariant) hopping matrix,  $U \geq 0$  a (repulsive) coupling constant, and  $n_j = c_j^\nu c_j^\nu$ . The kinetic part can also be written in diagonal form as

$$H_0 = \sum_{k; \nu} \epsilon_k a_k^\nu a_k^\nu \quad (2.2)$$

where  $\epsilon_k$  is the Fourier transform of  $t_{ij}$ .

The  $N$ -particle ground state of the non-interacting system ( $U = 0$ ) is given by

$$|j_0^N\rangle = \prod_{k \in F^N} \prod_{\nu} a_k^\nu |i\rangle \quad (2.3)$$

where the non-interacting  $N$ -particle Fermi sea  $F^N$  contains all momenta in  $B$  with  $\epsilon_k \leq \mu^N$ , and the chemical potential  $\mu^N$  is such that  $F^N$  contains  $N/2$  momenta ( $N = N_\uparrow + N_\downarrow$ , assume  $N_\uparrow = N_\downarrow$ , i.e.  $N$  is even). In the following we will frequently drop the index  $N$ . Let  $F^c = B \setminus F$  be the complement of the Fermi sea in  $B$ . Vectors  $k_F^-$  denote momenta in  $F$  on the border to  $F^c$ , while  $k_F^+$  denote momenta in  $F^c$  on the border to  $F$  (see Fig. 1). The set of all  $k_F^-$  and  $k_F^+$  form the "inner" and "outer" Fermi surface  $\partial F^-$  and  $\partial F^+$ , respectively. In the limit  $L \rightarrow \infty$  both sets define the same manifold  $\partial F$ , the Fermi surface. We assume  $N < L^d$  and  $\mu$  to be such that the Fermi surface is smooth and convex without nesting.

In the following, when considering very large finite systems or, more precisely, sequences of larger and larger systems, it will be important to distinguish various levels of "equality" of momenta:

- i) "microscopic" equality,  $k^0 = k$ , if both are precisely on the same site of the  $k$ -lattice,
- ii) "mesoscopic" equality,  $k^0 = k$ , if both may be separated by a finite number of steps on the  $k$ -lattice,
- iii) "macroscopic" equality,  $k^0 = k$ , if both may be separated by an infinite number of discrete steps (as  $L \rightarrow \infty$ ), which is smaller than  $O(L)$ , however, such that the distance between  $k^0$  and  $k$  shrinks to zero for  $L \rightarrow \infty$ .

Properties described for  $k^0 = k$  or  $k^0 = k$  will be understood to hold for "almost" all such cases (zero measure exceptions allowed);  $k^0 = k$  is what is usually implied by writing " $k^0 = k$ " in many-body theory, when performing calculations directly in the thermodynamic limit, where " $k$ " refers actually to (infinitely) many states, and it is supposed that they need not be distinguished any more, maintaining only their density  $V = (2\pi)^d$  in momentum space as the only information. On the other hand, the Pauli exclusion principle acts only in the case of "microscopic" equality, but is fortunately easy to build in exactly, and is all one needs of  $k$ -space structure in the non-interacting system. In general, in an interacting system it is not a priori clear whether the "internal" structure of a "point" in the continuum of momenta in the infinite volume limit is really irrelevant. A simple (though admittedly unphysical) example for an interaction where it is relevant would be a strict exclusion principle for particles with opposite spin on the same (in the microscopic sense) point in  $k$ -space. The Hubbard or other short range interactions are of course smooth in momentum space, but singularities in  $k$ -space might be generated non-perturbatively.

### 3. TWO PARTICLE WAVE FUNCTION

In this section the wave function for two particles with opposite spin in the presence of a Fermi sea will be evaluated. As in the Cooper problem, the Fermi sea will be assumed to be inert, i.e. its role is merely to block momentum space. Much of the calculation in (A) and (B) follows the analysis of the related problem of two particles on an empty lattice by Fabrizio, Parola and Tosatti.[6]

A) Schrodinger equation:

The wave function for two particles with total momentum  $P$  (conserved) is a linear combination

$$\psi = \sum_q L(q) \psi_{P=2\pi q}; P=2\pi q \in \Gamma \quad (3.1)$$

where the prime restricts the momenta  $P=2\pi q$  to  $\Gamma$ . The amplitudes  $L(q)$  obey the Schrodinger equation

$$(E - E^0(q))L(q) = \frac{U}{L^d} \sum_{q^0} L(q^0) = :C \quad (3.2)$$

where  $E^0(q) = E_{P=2+q}^0 + E_{P=2-q}^0$ . For  $U > 0$  there are two classes of solutions, a trivial class characterized by  $C = 0$ , and a non-trivial one with  $C \neq 0$ , respectively.

In the former case one has eigenvalues  $E = E^0$  where  $E^0$  is a non-interacting eigenvalue, and  $L(q) \neq 0$  only for  $q$  such that  $E^0(q) = E^0$ . In addition, the amplitudes are restricted by the condition  $\sum_q L(q) = 0$ . For each  $d^0$ -fold degenerate  $E^0$ , there are  $d^0 - 1$  such solutions, where  $d^0=2$  are spin-triplet and  $d^0=2-1$  spin-singlet (if  $d_0=2$ ). Usually  $d^0$  is at least two, due to the symmetry  $E^0(q) = E^0(-q)$ , an exception being  $E^0(0)$ .

In the latter class, one can solve for  $L(q)$ , and obtains

$$L(q) = \frac{C}{E_{P=2+q} - E_{P=2-q}} \quad (3:3)$$

while the eigenvalues  $E$  are determined by

$$\frac{1}{U} = \frac{1}{L^{d^0}} \sum_q (E_{P=2+q} - E_{P=2-q})^{-1} =: K_L(P; E) \quad (3:4)$$

Note that  $K_L(P; E)$  is a real function, which has simple poles at the non-interacting two-particle levels  $E^0(q)$ . The normalization  $1 = \langle \psi | \psi \rangle = \sum_q L(q)^2$  of the wave function fixes  $C$  as

$$C^2 = \sum_q (E_{P=2+q} - E_{P=2-q})^{-2} \quad (3:5)$$

For fixed total momentum  $P$ , the non-interacting two-particle levels  $E^0(q) = E_{P=2+q}^0 + E_{P=2-q}^0$  can be ordered in an ascending sequence  $E_0^0; E_1^0; \dots; E_M^0$ . In terms of  $E^0$ , the eigenvalue equation reads

$$\frac{1}{U} = \frac{1}{L^{d^0}} \sum_{E^0} \frac{d^0}{E - E^0} \quad (3:6)$$

where  $d^0$  is the degeneracy of the non-interacting level  $E^0$ . The right hand side has simple poles in  $E^0$ . Hence it is obvious that the solutions of (3.6) also form an ascending sequence  $E_0; E_1; \dots; E_M$ , where  $E_0 \leq E_1 < E_{+1}$ .

Let  $|j_{kk}\rangle$  denote the non-interacting eigenstate obtained by forming the symmetric (spin-singlet) linear combination of  $|j_k\rangle |k^0\rangle$  and  $|j_k^0\rangle |k\rangle$ , and possibly other states with the same energy  $E^0 = \epsilon_k + \epsilon_{k^0}$ . For each  $|j_{kk}\rangle$  there is a corresponding exact eigenstate  $|j_{kk}\rangle$  of  $H$ , related to  $|j_{kk}\rangle$  by continuity as  $U \rightarrow 0$ . In the following we will analyse the energy shift and the modification of these wave functions by the interaction. In particular we will calculate the overlap of interacting and non-interacting wave functions as a convenient and easy-to-understand measure for the wave function change, alternative to the "phase shift", which will also be discussed.

B) State  $|j_{kk}\rangle$  and "partial exclusion principle":

Let us now analyse the state  $|j_{kk}\rangle$  in dimensions  $d = 1, 2, 3$ . We will determine the energy shift  $E = E(U) - E^0$ , the overlap  $S_k = \langle j_{kk} | j_{kk} \rangle$  in the large volume limit, and, if this overlap is smaller than one, the "range" of the interacting wave function in  $k$ -space. Setting  $P = 2k$  and extracting the term with  $q = 0$ , the eigenvalue equation (3.4) becomes

$$\frac{1}{U} = \frac{1}{L^d E} + \frac{1}{L^d} \sum_{q \neq 0} \frac{1}{E - E^0(q)} =: \frac{1}{L^d E} + K_L(2k; E) \quad (3.7)$$

where  $E = E_{2k}$  and  $E^0(q) = \epsilon_{k+q} + \epsilon_{k-q} - 2\epsilon_k$ . Note that, for small  $q$ ,

$$E^0(q) = \sum_{i=1}^d a_i q_i^2; \quad q_i = (2\pi/L)n_i \quad \text{where } n_i \text{ integer} \quad (3.8)$$

i.e. the smallest  $E^0(q)$  are of order  $O(L^{-2})$ . 2D turns out to be a critical dimension here, because the distance from  $E^0(0) = 2\epsilon_k$  to the next non-interacting levels  $E^0(q)$  is of order  $L^{-2}$  in any dimension, while the potential energy of  $|j_{kk}\rangle$  (as a trial state) is  $U = L^d$ . The overlap  $S_k$  is given by the amplitude  $L(0) = C = E$ , where the normalization constant  $C$  can be written as

$$C^2 = \frac{1}{(E)^2} + \sum_{q \neq 0} \frac{1}{[E - E^0(q)]^2} \quad (3.9)$$

For  $E$  above  $2\epsilon_k$  but below the next non-interacting level  $E^0(q)$ , one has

$$K_L(2k; E) \sim \begin{cases} O(1) & \text{for } k = k_F^+ \\ O(L) & \text{for } k \neq k_F^+ \end{cases} \quad \text{in } d = 1 \quad (3.10a)$$

$$K_L(2k; E) \sim \begin{cases} O(1) & \text{for } k = k_F^+ \\ O(\log L) & \text{for } k \neq k_F^+ \end{cases} \quad \text{in } d = 2 \quad (3.10b)$$

$$K_L(2k; E) \sim O(1) \quad \text{in } d = 3 \quad (3.10c)$$

The exception for  $k = k_F^+$  in 1D is due to the complete blocking of states close to  $|j_{kk}\rangle$  by exclusion from the Fermi sea  $F$ . In  $d > 1$  there is no such complete blocking for  $k = k_F^+$  due to degrees of freedom parallel to the Fermi surface. Partial blocking makes  $K_L(2k; E)$  finite in 2D for  $k = k_F^+$ , while it diverges logarithmically otherwise. Inserting the asymptotic behavior of  $K_L(2k; E)$  into the eigenvalue equation (3.7), one obtains the energy shifts

$$E \sim \begin{cases} O(L^{-1}) & \text{for } k = k_F^+ \\ O(L^{-2}) & \text{for } k \neq k_F^+ \end{cases} \quad \text{in } d = 1 \quad (3.11a)$$

$$E \sim \begin{cases} O(L^{-2}) & \text{for } k = k_F^+ \\ O(L^{-2} \log L) & \text{for } k \neq k_F^+ \end{cases} \quad \text{in } d = 2 \quad (3.11b)$$

$$E \leq O(L^{-3}) \quad \text{in } d = 3 \quad (3.11c)$$

Rewriting (3.9) as  $(S_k)^2 = (E)^2 = C^2 = 1 + (E)^2 \sum_{q \neq 0} [E - E^0(q)]^{-2}$ , one thus obtains the overlap

$$S_k \leq \begin{cases} 1 - O(L^{-1}) & \text{for } k = k_F^{+ic} \\ r < 1 & \text{for } k \neq k_F^{+ic} \end{cases} \quad \text{in } d = 1 \quad (3.12a)$$

$$S_k \leq \begin{cases} r < 1 & \text{for } k = k_F^{+es} \\ 1 - O((\log L)^{-2}) & \text{for } k \neq k_F^{+es} \end{cases} \quad \text{in } d = 2 \quad (3.12b)$$

$$S_k \leq 1 - O(L^{-2}) \quad \text{in } d = 3 \quad (3.12c)$$

For  $k \neq k_F^{+ic}$  in 1D and  $k = k_F^{+es}$  in 2D, the behavior of  $K_L(2k; E)$  implies energy shifts  $E$  of the order of the level spacing,  $L^{-2}$ , and thus a finite reduction of the overlap  $S_k$ , for any non-zero interaction  $U$ . In 1D, the asymptotic overlap  $r$  does not depend on  $U$ , as long as  $U > 0$ , while 2D  $r$  is  $U$ -dependent and goes continuously to one for  $U \rightarrow 0$ . For  $k \neq k_F^{+es}$  in 2D,  $E$  turns out to be of order  $O(1/L^2 \log L)$ , i.e. too small for transferring a finite amplitude to other states besides  $|j_{kk}\rangle$ . For the exceptional case  $k = k_F^{+ic}$  in 1D, the energy shift  $E$  is of order  $L^{-1}$ , but here the next allowed levels are separated by a gap. The reader may compare with the corresponding results for two particles on an empty lattice in Ref. [6].

The overlap reduction  $S_k < 1$  implies that two particles with opposite spin cannot fully occupy the same  $k$ -state, a phenomenon which Anderson [1] refers to as "partial exclusion principle". To clearly see this effect it was important to take the limit  $L \rightarrow \infty$  only after having calculated the overlap for finite systems at finite  $U$ . The wave functions  $|j_{kk}\rangle$  are very short-ranged in  $k$ -space: The amplitudes  $L(q)$  in  $|j_{kk}\rangle$  are of order  $L^{-2}$  as soon as  $q$  differs macroscopically from zero, i.e. for  $L \rightarrow \infty$  the wave function  $|j_{kk}\rangle$  is confined to an infinitesimally small region in momentum space, and is therefore macroscopically indistinguishable from the non-interacting state  $|j_{kk}\rangle$ . In contrast to the case of Pauli exclusion, the state  $|j_{kk}\rangle$  is not (even partially) expelled from the Hilbert space of states. For  $L \rightarrow \infty$ , there is not even a partial transfer of amplitude to higher energies: Summing the squared probability amplitudes  $|L(0)|^2$  of states with total momentum  $P = 2k$  and energies  $E$  in an infinitesimal interval around  $2\epsilon_k$ , the total occupation probability one is recovered.

C) States  $|j_{kk^0}\rangle$ :

We now analyse the states  $|j_{kk^0}\rangle$  for generic momenta  $k$  and  $k^0$ . The energy shift  $E = E_k - E_{k^0}$  can be determined by splitting the eigenvalue equation (3.4) as

$$\frac{1}{U} = \frac{d^0}{L^d E} + L \sum_q \frac{d^X}{E - E^0(q)} = \frac{d^0}{L^d E} + K_L(k + k^0; E) \quad (3.13)$$

and studying the asymptotic behavior of  $K_L(k + k^0; E)$  for large  $L$ . Here  $d^0$  is the degeneracy of the non-interacting level  $E^0 = \epsilon_k + \epsilon_{k^0}$ , and  $E^0(q) = \epsilon_{k+q} + \epsilon_{k^0-q}$ ; the double prime indicates  $E^0(q) \notin E^0$  in addition to exclusion of  $k+q$  and  $k^0-q$  from the Fermi sea  $F$ . The overlap  $S_{kk^0} = \langle \psi_{kk^0} | \psi_{kk^0} \rangle$  is given by  $\frac{1}{d^0} C = E$ , where  $C$  is obtained from

$$C^2 = \frac{d^0}{(E)^2} + \sum_q \frac{1}{[E - E^0(q)]^2} \quad (3.14)$$

Recall that  $\langle \psi_{kk^0} |$  is a symmetric combination of  $d^0$  degenerate states (with amplitude  $1/\sqrt{d^0}$  for each). For  $L \rightarrow \infty$ , the right hand side of (3.14) is always dominated by levels in an infinitesimal interval around  $E$ . The qualitative behavior of the sum in (3.14) follows from the mean spacing  $\overline{E^0}$  of levels around  $E$ , which is related to the density of two-particle states

$$\rho(E) = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{L} \sum_q \chi_{\delta}(E - E^0(q)) \quad (3.15)$$

via

$$\overline{E^0} = d^0(E) = L^d \rho(E) \quad (3.16)$$

Here  $\chi_\delta(x)$  is a broadened delta-function of width  $\delta$ , and  $d^0(E)$  is the level degeneracy as determined by symmetry (accidental degeneracies possible for certain dispersion relations have zero measure). We will now discuss results for the overlap  $S_{kk^0}$  in various distinct cases.

If  $k$  or  $k^0$  (or both) are macroscopically distant from the Fermi surface, and in addition  $k^{\text{mac}} \notin k$ , one has a level spacing of order  $L^{-d}$  around  $E^0$ , and  $K_L$  is finite for  $E$  between  $E^0$  and the next non-interacting level. Hence  $E$  is of order  $L^{-d}$ , as the level spacing, which implies that finite amplitude is transferred to other levels, i.e.  $S_{kk^0} < 1$  in any dimension in this case.

If  $k = k^{\text{mac}}$  macroscopically distant from the Fermi surface, one finds

$$S_{kk^0} \sim \begin{cases} r < 1 & \text{in } d = 1 \\ 1 & \text{in } d = 2 \\ 1 & \text{in } d = 3 \end{cases} \quad (3.17)$$

as is easily understood by extending the corresponding results for  $k = k^{\text{ic}}$  in (3.12).

Let us now consider the important case where both momenta lie macroscopically on the Fermi surface, i.e.  $d(k; \partial F); d(k^0; \partial F) = 0$ , where  $d(\cdot; \cdot)$  denotes the euclidean distance between points or sets in  $k$ -space. In this case, the overlap obeys

$$S_{kk^0} \sim \begin{cases} r < 1 & \text{for } k = k^{\text{mac}} \\ 1 & \text{for } k = k^0 \end{cases} \quad \text{in } d = 1 \quad (3.18a)$$



$$S_{kk^0} = \begin{cases} r < 1 & \text{for } k^{\text{mac}} = k^0 \text{ and } \frac{d((k+k^0)=2; \partial F)}{d(k, k^0)} \text{ finite} \\ 1 & \text{else} \end{cases} \quad \text{in } d = 2 \quad (3.18b)$$

$$S_{kk^0} = 1 \quad \text{in } d = 3 \quad (3.18c)$$

for large systems. In deriving these results, the three cases  $k^{\text{mac}} = k^0$ ,  $k^{\text{mac}} < k^0$  and  $k^{\text{mac}} > k^0$  must be treated separately.

For  $k^{\text{mac}} < k^0$  (possible only in  $d > 1$ , for  $k$  and  $k^0$  on  $\partial F$ ), the two-particle density of states  $\rho(k + k^0; k + k^0)$  vanishes, i.e. the levels next to  $k + k^0$  are typically at infinite distance on scale  $L^{-d}$ . Hence no amplitude is transferred to other levels, and thus  $S_{kk^0} = 1$  for  $L \rightarrow \infty$ .

For  $k^{\text{mac}} = k^0$  (Cooper channel) the density of states is finite, but  $K_L(k + k^0; E)$  diverges logarithmically for large  $L$  (and  $E$  detached from non-interacting levels), i.e. the Schrödinger equation forces  $E$  down to order  $L^{-d} \log L$ , implying  $S_{kk^0} = 1 - O((\log L)^{-2})$  in any dimension.

For  $k^{\text{mac}} > k^0$  the density of states is divergent in 1D, zero in 3D, and has a rather subtle behavior in 2D. Let us discuss only the most difficult (and important) 2D case in detail. The general qualitative behavior can be understood by assuming a quadratic dispersion relation  $\epsilon_k = k^2/2$  for simplicity. Setting  $k_F = 1$ , the density of two-particle (or two-hole) states in 2D is then given by [7]

$$\rho(E) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } E < 0 \\ 1/4 & \text{for } 0 < E < 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} \sin^{-1} \frac{E-1}{E} & \text{for } 1 < E < 2 \\ 1/4 & \text{for } E > 2 \end{cases} \quad (3.19)$$

Here  $E$  is the energy relative to  $2\epsilon_F$ , i.e.  $E = \epsilon - 1$ , and the various regimes are separated by  $E_+ = E_+(P) = P + P^2/2$ ,  $E_- = E_-(P) = -P + P^2/2$  and  $E_0 = E_0(P) = (P-2)^2 - 1$ , respectively, where  $P = |p|$ . See Fig. 2 for an illustration of the various regimes in the  $(P; E)$ -plane. Note that here we make use only of the part where  $E > 0$ , corresponding to two particles, not holes. This density of states has a simple geometric interpretation: For quadratic dispersion, equi-energy manifolds for two particles with total momentum  $P$  are spheres (in 2D circles) with center  $P/2$  in  $k$ -space; in 2D, the density of all states (irrespective of whether particles are in  $F$  or  $F^c$ ) is  $1/4$  independent of  $P$  and  $E$ . The density of two particle states in  $F$  in 2D is thus simply  $x/4$ , where  $x \in [0; 1]$  is the fraction of diameters crossing the equi-energy circle with both ends in  $F$  (see Fig. 3 for an illustration). The same holds analogously for two holes. The singular behavior of  $\rho(E)$  in the limit  $P \rightarrow 2k_F$ ,  $E \rightarrow 2\epsilon_F$  is simply due to the fact that  $x$  may assume any value between zero and one, however close to the Fermi surface the particles may be. Thus it is clear that generically two particles in  $k$  and  $k^0$  with  $k^0 = k$  and other

levels within an energetic distance of order  $L^{-2}$ , the only exception being the cases where  $x = 0$ , corresponding to  $d((k + k^0)=2; \Theta_F) = d(k; k^0) \neq 0$ . It remains to see under which conditions  $K_L(k + k^0; E)$  is finite. In almost all cases there is an infinite number of levels above and below  $E^0 = \epsilon_k + \epsilon_{k^0}$  since we have required only macroscopic equality of  $k$  and  $k^0$ . Hence, for  $E = E^0 + E$  detached from non-interacting levels, we may check the finiteness of the sum  $K_L(k + k^0; E)$  for  $L \rightarrow \infty$  from the corresponding principal value integral  $\text{Re} K(k + k^0; E)$ , where

$$K(P; E) = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{i \rightarrow 0} K_L(P; E + i) \quad (3.20)$$

Note that it doesn't matter whether we insert  $K_L$  or  $\tilde{K}_L$  on the right hand side. For  $P \leq 2k_F$ ,  $K(P; E)$  is just the particle-particle bubble known in many-body perturbation theory (for  $P < 2k_F$ , however,  $K$  differs from the bubble since the two-hole contribution is absent in  $K$ ). In the regimes which are of interest here, i.e.  $P \geq 2k_F$  and  $E - 2\epsilon_F > 0$  not large,  $\text{Re} K(P; E)$  can be taken from earlier results for the particle-particle bubble in 2D [7], i.e.

$$\text{Re} K(P; E) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{4} \log \frac{4(\epsilon_c - \epsilon_0)(\epsilon_c + \epsilon_0)}{(\epsilon_+ - \epsilon_0)(\epsilon_+ + \epsilon_0)^2} & \text{for } \epsilon_0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_+ \\ \frac{1}{4} \log \frac{4(\epsilon_c - \epsilon_0)}{P^2} & \text{for } \epsilon < \epsilon_0 < \epsilon_+ \end{cases} \quad (3.21)$$

where  $\epsilon_c$  is an ultraviolet cutoff. Obviously  $\text{Re} K(P; E)$  does not have a unique limit for  $P \rightarrow 2k_F$ ,  $E \rightarrow 2\epsilon_F$ . Generically  $\text{Re} K(k + k^0; \epsilon_k + \epsilon_{k^0})$  is finite in the limit  $k; k^0 \rightarrow \Theta_F$ ,  $k^0 \rightarrow k$ , being divergent only (logarithmically) if the ratio  $d(k; k^0) = d((k + k^0)=2; \Theta_F)$  goes to zero in the limiting process (note that  $d((k + k^0)=2; \Theta_F) = P - 2k_F$  and  $d(k; k^0) = 2(\epsilon - \epsilon_0)^{1/2}$ ).

Hence, generically the overlap  $S_{kk^0}$  is reduced for  $k$  and  $k^0$  macroscopically on the same Fermi point in 2D, exceptions being the rare cases where the ratio  $d((k + k^0)=2; \Theta_F) = d(k; k^0)$  is either zero or infinite. The geometry of the generic and the two exceptional cases is shown in Fig. 4. Viewed as a limiting process where  $k; k^0 \rightarrow \Theta_F$ , the phase space for this wave function modification in the forward scattering channel vanishes with the same power as the one for Cooper scattering. Judging from Fig. 2 the effect in the forward scattering channel looks weaker because it corresponds to points in a quadratically narrowing region in the  $(P; \epsilon)$  plane, for  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ , while the Cooper processes take place in the only linearly narrowing region  $\epsilon > \epsilon_+(P)$ . However, the figure shows only a section in the  $d+1$  dimensional  $(P; \epsilon)$  space, where the Cooper processes take place in a cone around the  $\epsilon$ -axis, while the  $2k_F$ -processes live in a quadratically narrowing fissure encircling the  $\epsilon$ -axis at a fixed distance  $2k_F$ . Hence, in both cases the phase space vanishes quadratically in the low energy limit in 2D.

	$d(k; \partial F) + d(k^0; \partial F) \stackrel{m_{ac}}{=} 0$		$d(k; \partial F) + d(k^0; \partial F) \stackrel{m_{ac}}{\neq} 0$	
d	$k \stackrel{m_{ac}}{=} k^0$	$k \stackrel{m_{ac}}{\neq} k^0$	$k \stackrel{m_{ac}}{=} k^0$	$k \stackrel{m_{ac}}{\neq} k^0$
1	$r^{(a)}$	1	r	r
2	$r^{(b)}$	1	1	r
3	1	1	1	r

Table 1: Values of the overlap  $S_{kk^0}$ : r denotes an overlap  $< 1$ ; (a) the special case  $k \stackrel{m_{ic}}{=} k^0 \stackrel{m_{ic}}{=} k_F^+$  has  $S_{kk^0} = 1$ , (b)  $S_{kk^0} < 1$  generically for  $d((k + k^0); \partial F) = d(k; k^0) = \text{nite} \neq 0$  and also for  $k \stackrel{m_{ic}}{=} k^0 \stackrel{m_{es}}{=} k_F^+$  and  $k \stackrel{m_{es}}{=} k^0 \stackrel{m_{ic}}{=} k_F^+$  (including  $k \stackrel{m_{ic}}{=} k^0 \stackrel{m_{ic}}{=} k_F^+$ ).

The results for  $S_{kk^0}$  in  $d = 1; 2; 3$  dimensions are summarized in table 1. Analogous results hold for two holes instead of two particles.

#### D) Phase shift versus phase angle:

The phase shift for two interacting particles in a nite system is defined by [1, 8]

$$= E - E^0 \quad (3.22)$$

where  $E = E - E^0$ ,  $E^0 = E^0_{+1} - E^0$ . Recall that  $= 0; 1; 2; \dots; M$  labels all the different non-interacting two-particle energies  $E^0$  of two particles with fixed total momentum  $P$  in a sequence of monotonously increasing energies, and the interacting eigenvalues obey  $E^0 < E < E^0_{+1}$  for  $= 0; \dots; M - 1$ . The phase shift is a measure for the modification of the non-interacting wave function  $j$  by interactions. It is nite if  $h_j < 1$  and zero if  $h_j = 1$ . The term "phase shift" derives from an expression of the form (3.22) for the phase shifts in a partial wave decomposition in scattering theory.[9] In  $d > 1$ , is a wildly fluctuating function of , which requires a proper average over many levels in order to obtain a well defined limiting function for  $L \rightarrow \infty$ .

The phase angle  $(E)$  is defined [5] by

$$(E) = j(E) \exp[i(E)] \quad (3.23)$$

where  $(E)$  is the 2-particle scattering vertex for an nite system, which is given by

$$(E) = \frac{U}{1 - UK(E)} \quad (3.24)$$

and  $K(E)$  is obtained from  $K_L(E)$ , (3.4), via the limiting procedure  $K(E) = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} K_L(E)$ ; the dependence on the total momentum has not been written here. Note that our  $K(E)$  is slightly different from the particle-particle bubble in perturbation theory, since in  $K_L(E)$  two-hole contributions are absent.

Phase shift and phase angle are in general different quantities, even for large  $L$ , except in  $d = 1$ . In [8] their equivalence has been shown with the tacit assumption that  $\delta(E)$  tends to a continuous function  $\delta(E)$  as  $L$  increases, which is however not generally the case. Only in 1D  $\delta(E)$  has a unique limit for  $L \rightarrow \infty$  and  $E^0 \rightarrow E$ , and one can indeed show that

$$\delta(E) := \lim_{\substack{L \rightarrow \infty \\ E^0 \rightarrow E}} \delta(E) = \delta(E) \quad (3.25)$$

and the overlap of interacting and non-interacting wave functions is related to the phase shift by the simple identity

$$\langle \psi_j | \psi_i \rangle = \frac{\sin \delta(E)}{\delta(E)} \quad (3.26)$$

in this case. A derivation for these relations is given in Appendix A.

Phase shifts and phase angles for two particles with fixed total momentum and variable energy are shown in Fig. 5 for a 1D system and in Fig. 6 for a 2D system. The phase shifts have been calculated for a Hubbard model with next neighbor hopping  $t = 1$  and interaction  $U = 5$ , on a large but finite lattice. In 1D the relation (3.25) is seen to be verified, while in 2D the phase shifts fluctuate around the phase angle. In 2D one may define a function  $\bar{\delta}(E)$  representing the mean phase shift obtained by averaging many points in a small energy interval. For the systems studied here it turned out that this mean phase shift generically differs from the phase angle (at small energies it is larger), but  $\bar{\delta}(E)$  behaves qualitatively similar to  $\delta(E)$ , i.e. one has

$$\delta(E) = \bar{\delta}(E) \delta(E) \quad (3.27)$$

where  $\bar{\delta}(E)$  is a smooth function of order one. In particular, a finite phase angle implies a finite mean phase shift and vice versa. Furthermore, following the steps in [8], it is easy to see that there is a general identity relating the phase angle to the average energy shift, namely

$$\delta(E) = \overline{E - E^0} \quad (3.28)$$

where  $\overline{E - E^0}$  is the mean level spacing.

A controversy in previous studies arose on whether the phase shift for two particles on the same point of the Fermi surface in 2D is finite or not, the problem being that the limit  $P \rightarrow 2k_F, E \rightarrow 2E_F$  is not unique. It was noticed that the asymptotic phase angle is finite if the limit is taken in a particular way.[3, 7, 8] However, as we have pointed out above, what looks so special a limit in the  $(P; E)$  plane reflects actually the generic behavior of two particles with momenta  $k^0$  and  $k$  in the limit  $k^0 \rightarrow k \rightarrow \partial F$ . Anderson's [1] finite phase shift, which has originally been calculated in the special case  $k = k^{mac}$ , is generically present for  $k = k^{ac}$ , too.

The detailed behavior of the phase angle  $(k + k^0)$  with  $P = k + k^0$  for two particles in  $k$  and  $k^0$  in the limit  $k^0 \rightarrow k$  is illustrated in Fig. 7.

E) Antibound states:

To complete the presentation of the two-particle problem in a lattice model (with an upper bound in energy), we now briefly discuss properties of the "antibound state" [1] on top of the two-particle spectrum.

Since  $E < E_{+1}^0$  for  $M \rightarrow 1$ , all levels but the highest (for a given total momentum  $P$ ) are shifted only by a tiny amount of order  $L^{-d}$  or even less in some cases. However  $E_M = E_M - E_M^0$  turns out to be finite if  $U$  exceeds a critical value  $U_c$ , which depends on density and dimensionality. In d = 2, (3.4) implies that  $U_c = 0$ , since the density of two-particle levels is finite (in 2D) or divergent (in  $d < 2$ ) at the upper band edge. For small  $U$ ,  $E_M$  is exponentially small in 2D, while it is of order  $U^2$  in 1D. This split state has been called the "antibound state". [1] It is in a sense the mirror image of the bound state in the Cooper problem with attractive  $U$ .

The antibound state  $|j_M\rangle$  is actually a bound state in that it has a finite expectation value for double occupancy of sites in real space even for  $L \rightarrow 1$ , i.e.

$$\langle n_M | H_I | j_M \rangle \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{for } U > U_c \quad (3.29)$$

This is of course energetically highly unfavorable for repulsive (positive)  $U$ , which is why

$E_M$  is positive of order one. Since the trace of  $H_I$  in the subspace of two-particle states with fixed total momentum is always  $U$ , independent of the basis, equation (3.29) implies that

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow 1} \langle n_M | H_I | j_M \rangle < U \quad \text{for } U > U_c \quad (3.30)$$

Hence the splitting of an antibound state means that the other states in the continuum have an overall reduced expectation value for double occupancy, and  $|j_M\rangle$  just pays the bill for all of them. In the Hilbert space of two-particle states spanned by  $|f\rangle$  with  $f = 0, \dots, M-1$  double occupancy has been partially projected out. In 2D, this projection is a weak coupling effect (present for any  $U > 0$ ), in 3D not.

Ignoring states which are separated by a gap from the low-energy part of the spectrum, one may say that the presence of a down-spin, say, reduces the dimensionality of the space of available states for up-spin particles, as in the presence of statistical interactions [10] between opposite spins. The significance of the antibound states in the two-particle system for the many-particle system is however not yet clear. Anderson [1] suggested that the splitting of the antibound states implies that the Hubbard model in  $d = 2$  might have the same low energy behavior as the tJ-model, where doubly occupied sites are

projected out completely. A full projection of double occupancy can be implemented by gauge fields, leading to singular effective interactions which have been argued to invalidate Fermi liquid theory for the tJ-model (at least at finite temperatures). [11] Thus, if the above (controversial!) arguments were valid, Fermi liquid theory would break down in the 2D Hubbard model for any  $U > U_c = 0$ .

#### 4. ORTHOGONALITY CATASTROPHE

Long ago Anderson [12] pointed out that a local scatterer in a many fermion system changes the wave function so drastically that its overlap with the wave function without scatterer is zero in the infinite volume limit, and related this "orthogonality catastrophe" to the observed singular response of electron systems to a sudden appearance of local scatterers, such as in the X-ray problem. More recently he proposed to extend this line of reasoning to the insertion of a quasiparticle in an interacting Fermi system. [1]

To understand the argument, it is useful to recall the case of a local scatterer first. A system of non-interacting (spinless) fermions in the presence of a local potential on site 0 is governed by the Hamiltonian

$$H = \sum_k \epsilon_k n_k + U \sum_{k,q} L_{k+q}^d a_{k+q}^y a_k \quad (4.1)$$

The ground state of  $H$  is a Slater-determinant constructed with single particle wave functions of the form  $|j_k\rangle = \sum_q L_k(q) a_{k+q}^y |j\rangle$  where  $L_k(q) = C_k / (E_k - \epsilon_{k+q})$ , the eigenvalue  $E_k$  is the solution next to  $\epsilon_k$  of  $U^{-1} = \sum_q L_{k+q}^d (E - \epsilon_{k+q})^{-1}$ , and  $C_k$  is fixed by normalization. Note that  $E_k = \epsilon_k$  and  $C_k$  are both typically of order  $L^{-d}$ , corresponding to the spacing of the non-interacting levels (except for  $k = 0$ ). The overlap of the Fermi seas with and without scattering potential, respectively, is given by [12]

$$S = \langle j | j \rangle = \det_{k,p \in 2F} (L_{kp}) \quad (4.2)$$

where  $L_{kp} = L_k(p - k)$ . Note that  $L_{kp}$  decays rapidly as a function of  $p - k$ , but the momentum transfer  $p - k$  may be large. A sufficient condition for the orthogonality catastrophe  $S \neq 0$  when  $L \rightarrow 1$  is that the sum

$$s = \sum_{k \in 2F} \sum_{p \in 2F} L_{kp}^2 \quad (4.3)$$

diverges. Indeed  $s$  behaves roughly as  $L^{-2d} \sum_{k \in 2F} \sum_{p \in 2F} (p - k)^{-2}$ , which is logarithmically infrared divergent for  $L \rightarrow 1$  in any dimension. Note that contributions come from any  $q = p - k$  (not only small ones) across the Fermi surface. To obtain the orthogonality

catastrophe it is important that all (or at least a finite fraction of) the single particle states  $a_k^y |j\rangle$  with  $k \geq k_F$  are modified by the scatterer, i.e.  $\langle k | j \rangle < 1$  or, what is the same, the phase shift  $\delta_k = E_k - E_k^0$  must be finite all over the Fermi surface ( $E_k$  being the distance to the level following  $k$ ).

Recently Anderson [1] suggested to infer the breakdown of Fermi liquid theory in two-dimensional interacting electron systems from an orthogonality catastrophe caused by insertion of an extra particle. To this end he considers the overlap

$$Z_k^0 = \langle a_k^y | j \rangle \langle j | a_k^{N+1} \rangle^2 \quad (4.4)$$

for " $k = k_F$ ". Here  $|j\rangle$  is the exact ground state with  $N$  particles while  $|a_k^{N+1}\rangle$  is an exact eigenstate of the  $N + 1$  particle system with "one quasi particle added", i.e. the state evolving adiabatically from the non-interacting state  $a_k^y |j\rangle$ , as the interaction is switched on. In analogy to the local scatterer problem it is argued that the finite phase shift induced by the extra particle on the other particles on the Fermi surface will lead to an orthogonality catastrophe,  $Z_{k_F}^0 \neq 0$ , and consequently the elimination of the quasi particle peak in the spectral function.

This argument presents various difficulties which we will now discuss.

(i) The macroscopic spectral function  $\rho(k; \omega)$  is given in terms of exact eigenstates by

$$\rho(k; \omega) = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \sum_n \langle a_k^{N+1} | a_k^y | j \rangle^2 \delta(\omega - \epsilon_n) \quad (4.5)$$

for positive energies  $\omega > 0$ ; the sum runs over all  $(N+1)$ -particle eigenstates with momentum  $k$  and spin (relative to  $|j\rangle$ ),  $\epsilon_n$  is the excitation energy, and  $\delta$  a broadened  $\delta$ -function, e.g.  $\delta(x) = \frac{1}{\eta} \exp(-x^2/\eta^2)$ . Each "point"  $\rho(k; \omega)$  in  $\rho(k; \omega)$  involves actually an infinite number of eigenstates of the interacting system. Hence the vanishing of the overlap with a single eigenstate in the large system limit does not necessarily affect  $\rho(k; \omega)$ . In particular, it is easy to see that  $Z_k^0 \neq 0$  for generic  $k = k_F^{m.ac}$  in any dimension, even in a Fermi liquid. By definition, in a Fermi liquid the spectral function obeys the asymptotic behavior

$$\rho(k; \omega) \sim Z_k \delta(\omega - E_k) \quad (4.6)$$

for  $\omega \neq 0, k \neq k_F$ , where  $E_k$  is the quasi particle energy,  $Z_k$  a finite renormalization constant, and  $\delta_k$  the width of the quasi particle peak, which must vanish more rapidly than the quasi particle energy when approaching the Fermi surface. In a Fermi liquid, for  $k = k_F^{m.ac}$  the width of the quasi particle peak is zero on scale one, but generically finite on the scale set by the level spacing. Hence,  $Z_k^0$  is zero in this case. To have a chance to get a finite  $Z_{k_F}^0$ , one must set at least  $k = k_F^{m.es}$ , which would however leave the numerical

value of  $Z_{k_F}^0$  completely arbitrary, if finite (e.g., for  $k$  a hundred steps on the  $k$ -lattice away from  $\partial F$ ,  $Z_k^0$  is much smaller than for  $k = k_F^+$ ). A reasonable unique definition of a possibly finite  $Z_{k_F}^0$  requires the choice  $k = k_F^+$  in (4.4). We are not aware of a general identity relating  $Z_{k_F}^0$  to the renormalization factor  $Z_{k_F}$  in (4.6). A priori  $Z_{k_F}^0$  might still vanish even if  $Z_{k_F}$  is finite (but not vice versa, of course).

(ii) In contrast to the local scatterer problem, the extra particle inserted here has a complicated dynamics, and the overlap (4.4) cannot be calculated exactly. Making an estimate in analogy to the case of a local scatterer added to a Fermi gas amounts to making two (independent) approximations, which may miss important physics: The system in the absence of the extra particle is treated as non-interacting, i.e. the ground state  $|j_0^N\rangle$  becomes simply a product of two non-interacting Fermi seas for up and down spins, i.e.  $|j_0^N\rangle = |j_0^N\rangle$ . Only interactions between the extra particle (with spin down, say) and particles with opposite spin (i.e. up) are kept. Still the calculation of  $|j_{k_F}^{N+1}\rangle$  poses a many-body problem, due to effective interactions between up-spins mediated by the extra down-spin: an up-spin may scatter the down-spin to a new state, which changes its relation to other up-spins.[13] For a local scatterer (without internal degrees of freedom) this problem does not occur, because the scatterer remains always in the same state. Neglecting these induced correlations, too, one may estimate the overlap  $ha_{k_F}^Y = \langle j_0^N | j_{k_F}^{N+1} \rangle$  in analogy to the problem of a local scatterer by approximating

$$ha_{k_F}^Y = \langle j_0^N | j_{k_F}^{N+1} \rangle = \det_{k \in 2F} (L_{kp}) \quad (4:7)$$

where  $L_{kp} = L_k(p - k)$ , and the amplitudes  $L_k(q)$  are extracted from the interacting two-particle wave functions evolving from  $|j_{kk_F}\rangle$ , i.e.

$$|j_{kk_F}\rangle = \sum_q L_k(q) |j + q - k_F - q\rangle \quad (4:8)$$

solved for fixed  $k = k_F^+$  and variable  $k \in 2F$  in presence of an inert Fermi sea of down-spins, but no other up-spins. Here only the down-spin momentum  $k_F - q$  is blocked by exclusion from  $F$ . Note that only the up-spins reduce the overlap, since the down spin Fermi sea is treated as inert. Since the up-spins are not blocked by a pre-existent Fermi sea, most  $|j_{kk_F}\rangle$  will be shifted from the corresponding non-interacting states  $|j_{kk_F}\rangle$ . However, most modifications inside  $F$  in  $k$ -space cancel out when the Fermi sea is filled, and only shifts leading out of  $F$ , as measured by the sum  $s = \sum_{k \in 2F} \sum_{p \in 2F} L_{kp}^2$ , are relevant. These latter shifts are of the same order of magnitude as those considered in Sec. 3, where  $|j_{kk_F}\rangle$  has been analyzed for  $k$  and  $k^0$  on the surface of two already pre-existent Fermi seas.



iii) In Sec. 3 we have seen that two particles on the Fermi surface may be scattered within  $F^-$  only if they are on the same point of the surface. Analogously, an extra down-particle added to the system in  $k_F^-$  in the presence of an inert Fermi sea down-spins may scatter up-particles out of  $F^-$  into  $F^-$  only in  $k_F^-$  itself, but not on other points of the surface. Even worse, if  $k_F^- = k_F^{+ic}$ , in most cases the extra particle is not able to scatter any up-spin out of  $F^-$  (this is slightly different from the situation in Sec. 3, where both particles were outside  $F^-$  from the start, and thus could always shift parallel to the Fermi surface in  $d > 1$ ). Comparing this state of affairs with the response to a local scatterer, where a wave function change over the whole Fermi surface led to a logarithmically (only) divergent signal of orthogonality, it is obvious that here we find no signal at all.

In summary, a straightforward adaption of the local scatterer calculation to the problem of inserting a dynamical particle into an interacting many-body system does not signal an orthogonality catastrophe in 2D. Stamp, [3] too, concluded that considering finite systems within a two-particle scattering approximation does not yield any evidence for an orthogonality catastrophe. Clearly, approximating the ground state by a Fermi gas may give qualitatively correct results only if the exact ground state is a Fermi liquid. Hence, as in perturbation theory, we have only checked consistency of quasiparticle behavior as a hypothesis. We have to recognize that the above check of orthogonality is insufficient, if the exact ground state is neither a Fermi liquid nor a state obtained by resumming divergencies showing up in perturbation theory (as in the one-dimensional Luttinger liquid [14, 15]).

Note that the phase shift as calculated in Sec. 3 does not signal the orthogonality catastrophe which is known to occur in a 1D interacting Fermi system upon adding an extra particle near one of the two Fermi points! A particle inserted in  $k_F^{+ic}$  cannot kick out any states near  $k_F^+$  itself in 1D (and for  $k_F^{+es}$  it can affect only a finite number). Hence interactions with particles near the same Fermi point do not produce an orthogonality catastrophe in 1D, whether the phase shift is finite or not. On the other hand, interactions with particles on the opposite Fermi point do affect infinitely many states, and second order perturbation theory does indeed indicate an orthogonality catastrophe in this case. However, the phase shift calculated in Sec. 3 turned out to be zero in this case, vanishing logarithmically in the large system limit. This is an artefact of our treating the Fermi surface as inert, not allowing for particle-hole excitations when calculating two-particle correlations. In a diagrammatic language, treating the Fermi sea as inert means summing only ladder diagrams, which is equivalent to introducing a renormalized coupling whose flow is calculated from the particle-particle channel only, and therefore seems to scale to zero logarithmically (for positive bare coupling). In 1D

there are however other contributions, involving particle-hole excitations, which make the  $\chi$ -function vanish identically, [14, 16] i.e. the renormalized coupling and the exact phase shift in the many-body system remain finite, and an orthogonality catastrophe does occur.

## 5. CONCLUSION

Two fermions in the presence of a Fermi sea can have interaction induced correlations even if both particles are situated on the Fermi surface: In addition to the well-known Cooper pair correlations for attractive interactions, in low dimensional systems correlations appear even for purely repulsive interactions, namely i) if both particles sit on the same point of the Fermi surface (in  $d = 2$ ), and ii) if they sit on opposite points (in  $d = 1$ ). In the former case a solution of the Schrodinger equation for a two-particle wave function in presence of an inert Fermi sea reveals these correlations, while in the latter case one must allow for particle-hole excitations to obtain the correct result for a many-body system. Equivalently, in the former case a properly interpreted T-matrix calculation yields the effect, while in the latter a complete one-loop renormalization group calculation of the two-particle vertex is required.

In the full many-body problem we must actually distinguish correlations between bare particles and correlations between low energy excitations (i.e. quasiparticles in a Fermi liquid). Correlations among bare particles are of course always present in an interacting theory, but are largely absorbed in the wave function renormalization when passing to an effective theory of the low energy excitations. The issue here is whether there are correlations between (tentative) quasiparticles, surviving at arbitrarily low energy scale. Of course the above refers to these latter correlations only.

It was important to distinguish various scales of distances on the  $k$ -lattice of momenta, to obtain a clear picture of the rather singular correlations in  $k$ -space, and to relate Anderson's [1] results for the phase shift to results from the T-matrix approximation.[2] Anderson's finite phase shift, calculated for two particles residing on the very same point of the  $k$ -lattice, was seen to be not an artefact of this special choice, but represents the generic behavior in the limit  $k; k^0 \rightarrow 0$  with  $k^0 \rightarrow k$ . This behavior is in fact correctly signalled by the corresponding limit of the phase angle of the scattering vertex calculated in T-matrix approximation.

Two fermions on the Fermi surface of a two-dimensional system repel each other at very short distances in momentum space. We note that this "partial exclusion principle" [1] is not only "partial", but also less persistent than genuine statistical correlations such as Pauli exclusion: The expectation value  $\langle n_{k_F} n_{k_F + i} \rangle$  will rise when more and more particles are added to the system, and may come arbitrarily close to one. The amplitude for two particles on the same Fermi point is only partitioned among different eigenstates with

energies in an infinitesimal interval at  $2\epsilon_F$ . However, the independence of quasiparticles is obviously spoiled by these correlations at short distances in  $k$ -space. Since quasiparticles on different Fermi points are however uncorrelated in 2D, Landau parameters involving a smooth angular average may still be well defined.

The orthogonality effect caused by addition of an extra particle on the Fermi surface of a two-dimensional Fermi gas was shown to be finite within a crude approximation which takes into account only two-particle correlations between the extra particle and other particles in the system. This confirms earlier consistency checks of Fermi liquid theory performed directly in the infinite volume limit, [7, 8] and a recent study showing the irrelevance of finite size effects in the  $T$ -matrix approximation. [3] In contrast to the case of addition of a local scatterer, which modifies the wave functions of other particles over the whole Fermi surface, a quasiparticle in 2D modifies the wave functions at best on that Fermi point where it is added. In one dimension an orthogonality catastrophe does occur as a consequence of finite phase shifts for particles on opposite Fermi points.

All well established weak coupling instabilities of the Fermi liquid are signalled by the renormalization group, evaluated perturbatively to some low order. [14, 17, 18, 19] A recent analysis of the crossover from 1D Luttinger liquid behavior to 2D Fermi liquid behavior as a function of continuous dimensionality within perturbation theory summed to all orders indicates that at weak coupling higher orders in perturbation theory do not destroy the Fermi liquid fixed point in any dimension above one, as long as no Cooper instability sets in. [20] In addition, recent rigorous results on two-dimensional Fermi systems seem to indicate that the existence of hitherto unknown weak coupling instabilities of the Fermi liquid is unlikely. [18] These rigorous results are however not yet general enough to be applied to a system like the Hubbard model.

On the other hand, the rather peculiar change of the two-particle wavefunction, especially in 2D, could throw doubts on the general validity of conventional many-body theory itself, even if summed to all orders. Two particles near the same Fermi point indeed develop singular correlations in  $k$ -space, which are however visible only if the discrete  $n$ -structure of  $k$ -space is resolved. These correlations might not be adequately taken into account when taking the infinite volume limit before solving the full interacting problem. In a two-dimensional Fermi liquid ground state, pairs of up- and down-spins near a common Fermi point would seem quite unstable objects: they have a tendency to repel each other but they can't, being blocked by their neighbors in  $k$ -space. The hypothesis of a complete non-perturbative reorganization of the ground state is therefore not completely implausible. In one dimension the repulsion of particles from common points in momentum space affects only excitations, not the ground state, which is instead modified by interactions between opposite Fermi points. However, in two dimensions the situa-

tion may be different, since new gapless degrees of freedom parallel to the Fermi surface appear.

In summary, in our opinion there are interesting hints but no evidence for a breakdown of Fermi liquid theory at weak coupling in two dimensions. Clear is only that such a breakdown would have to be much more subtle than in one dimension.

Acknowledgements: We would like to thank Phil Anderson, Carlo Di Castro and Michele Fabrizio for numerous valuable discussions. This work has been supported by the European Economic Community under Contract No. SC1\* 0222-C (EDB). One of us (W.M.) also gratefully acknowledges the kind hospitality of the Condensed Matter Group at Princeton University, and financial support by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft.

## Appendix A : Phase shift, phase angle and overlap in 1D

In one dimension, the non-interacting two-particle spectrum  $fE^0$  of states with fixed total momentum  $P$  is locally invariant, i.e. the levels become equidistant in the limit  $L \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $E^0 \rightarrow E$ , with a spacing  $E^0 = E_{+1}^0 - E^0$  that depends only on  $E$ . The level degeneracy  $d^0$  also becomes a function of  $E$  only. In this situation, the phase shift, energy shift and wave function overlap are uniquely determined by the phase angle, for almost all states in the large system limit, as we will now show.

For large  $L$ , and assuming local spectral invariance, the eigenvalue equation (3.6) can be written as [3, 21]

$$\frac{1}{U} = K_L^{\text{loc}}(E) + \text{Re}K(E) \quad (\text{A } 1)$$

where  $K(E) \equiv \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{L \rightarrow 1} K_L(E + i)$ , and

$$K_L^{\text{loc}}(E) = L^d \sum_{m=-1}^X \frac{d^0}{E - E_m^0} \quad (\text{A } 2)$$

is the "local sum", which is determined by levels in an infinitesimal interval centered at  $E$ . Here  $E^0 = E^0(E)$  is the level spacing, and  $d^0 = d^0(E)$  the degeneracy of levels with energy  $E$ . This decomposition holds asymptotically for almost all levels, exceptions being levels which are so close to the bottom or top of the spectrum that their local sum does not extend over a large number of levels on both sides. Using the identity  $\sum_{m=-1}^X (x - E_m)^{-1} = \cot(x)$ , one obtains

$$K_L^{\text{loc}}(E) = \rho(E) \cot(\rho(E)) \quad (\text{A } 3)$$

where  $\rho(E) = d^0 L^d E^0$  is the density of states, and

$$\rho(E) \equiv \frac{d^0}{E^0} \quad (\text{A } 4)$$

the phase shift. Inserting (A 3) into the eigenvalue equation, and solving for  $\rho(E)$ , one finds

$$\rho(E) = \tan^{-1} \frac{U \rho(E)}{1 - U \text{Re}K(E)} \quad (\text{A } 5)$$

Since  $\rho(E) = \text{Im}K(E)$ , this is nothing but the phase angle  $\rho(E)$ , defined in (3.23). Hence, for locally invariant spectra, phase shift and phase angle are indeed equivalent for large systems. A slightly different derivation of this result can be found in Ref. [8].

The normalization constant  $C$  is given by

$$C^{-2} = (C^{-2})^{\text{loc}} = L^d \sum_{m=-1}^X \frac{d^0}{[E - E_m^0]^2} \quad (\text{A } 6)$$

for  $L \neq 1$  and local spectral invariance. Note that here only levels in an infinitesimal neighborhood around  $E$  contribute. Using the identity  $\sum_{m=-1}^1 (x - m)^2 = 3 = (\sin(x))^2$ , one obtains

$$C(E) = \frac{1}{d^0} \sum_j \sin \frac{j}{L^d} \quad (\text{A:7})$$

The overlap between interacting and non-interacting wave functions is thus

$$\langle \psi_j | \psi_i \rangle = S(E) = \frac{1}{d^0} C(E) = \frac{\sin(E)}{(E)} \quad (\text{A:8})$$

Recall that  $\psi_j$  is a symmetric combination of  $d^0$  degenerate states with amplitude  $1/d^0$  for each. The overlap of  $\psi_{k^0}$  and  $\psi_{k^0}$  is obtained from this by inserting  $E = k + k^0$ .

## References

- [1] P.W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. Lett. 64, 1839 (1990); Phys. Rev. Lett. 65, 2306 (1990); High- $T_c$  superconductivity (to be published), chapter 6.
- [2] Careful second order and T-matrix calculations for repulsive interactions have been carried out by J.R. Engelbrecht and M. Randeria, Phys. Rev. Lett. 65, 1032 (1990); Phys. Rev. B 45, 12419 (1992); H. Fukuyama, Y. Hasegawa and O. Narikiyo, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 60, 2013 (1991);
- [3] P.C.E. Stamp, J. Phys. I (France) 3, 625 (1993).
- [4] J.R. Engelbrecht and M. Randeria, Phys. Rev. Lett. 66, 3325 (1991).
- [5] P.W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. Lett. 66, 3326 (1991).
- [6] M. Fabrizio, A. Parola and E. Tosatti, Phys. Rev. B 44, 1033 (1991).
- [7] H. Fukuyama, Y. Hasegawa and O. Narikiyo, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 60, 2013 (1991).
- [8] J.R. Engelbrecht and M. Randeria, Phys. Rev. Lett. 65, 1032 (1990); Phys. Rev. B 45, 12419 (1992).
- [9] K. Gottfried, Quantum Mechanics (Benjamin, New York, 1966), Vol. I, Sec. 49.
- [10] For a notion of statistical interactions, see F.D.M. Haldane, Phys. Rev. Lett. 67, 937 (1991).
- [11] see, for example, G. Baskaran and P.W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. B 37, 580 (1988); L.B. Ioffe and A.I. Larkin, Phys. Rev. B 39, 8988 (1989); P.A. Lee and N. Nagaosa, Phys. Rev. B 46, 5621 (1992).
- [12] P.W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. Lett. 18, 1049 (1967).
- [13] A related problem, namely a single down-spin interacting with a sea of up-spins, but no Fermi sea for down-spins present, has been studied in some detail by T. Kopp, A.E. Ruckenstein and S. Schmitt-Rink, Phys. Rev. B 42, 6850 (1990), and also by P. Nozières (private communication). The recoil of the (mobile) down-spin has been shown to prevent an orthogonality catastrophe in this problem.
- [14] For a review on one-dimensional electronic systems, see J. Solym, Adv. Phys. 28, 201 (1979).

- [15] F D M .Haldane, J.Phys.C 14, 2585 (1981).
- [16] C.D iCastro and W .M etzner, Phys.Rev.Lett. 67, 3852 (1991); W .M etzner and C.D iCastro, Phys.Rev.B 47, 16107 (1993).
- [17] G .Benfatto and G .G allavotti, Phys.Rev.B 42, 9967 (1990); J.Stat.Phys. 59, 541 (1990).
- [18] J.Feldm an and E .T rubow itz, Helv. Phys. A ct. 63, 156 (1990); 64, 213 (1991); J.Feldm an, J.M agnen, V .R ivasseau and E .T rubow itz, Helv. Phys. A ct. 65, 679 (1992).
- [19] R .Shankar, Physica A 177, 530 (1991); Rev.M od.Phys. 66, 129 (1994).
- [20] C .Castellani, C .D iCastro and W .M etzner, Phys.Rev.Lett. 72, 316 (1994).
- [21] B .S.D eW itt, Phys.Rev.103, 1565 (1956).



## Figure Captions

- Fig. 1 Fermi surfaces  $\mathcal{F}^-$  and  $\mathcal{F}^+$  on the discrete  $k$ -lattice in a finite system; the continuous line represents the Fermi surface  $\mathcal{F}$  in the large system limit.
- Fig. 2 Regimes for the two-particle density of states in the  $(P; \epsilon)$ -plane, separated by the functions  $\epsilon_+(P)$ ,  $\epsilon_-(P)$  and  $\epsilon_0(P)$ . The dotted line indicates values for  $(P; \epsilon)$  with  $\epsilon = \epsilon_+ = 4$ ,  $\epsilon_- = 0.3$ .
- Fig. 3 Geometry of available two-particle states with fixed total momentum  $P$  and fixed energy in two dimensions. The bold sections on the circle around  $P=2$  indicate the possible locations of momenta  $k$  and  $k^0$  outside  $\mathcal{F}$  such that  $k + k^0 = P$  and  $\epsilon_k + \epsilon_{k^0} = \text{const.}$
- Fig. 4 Two particles in  $k^{\text{m ac}} = k$  on the same Fermi point in 2D: generic case (a) and the two exceptional cases (b) and (c). Note that the plot shows an infinitesimal fraction of the Fermi surface, which therefore looks perfectly flat.
- Fig. 5 Phase shifts (points) and phase angle (line) as function of energy for a Hubbard model with next-neighbor hopping  $t=1$ , coupling  $U=5$  and  $\epsilon_F = 1.3$  in 1D, for a fixed total momentum  $P=0$ . The phase shifts have been calculated for a finite system with  $L=1000$ .
- Fig. 6 Phase shifts (dots), phase angle (solid line) and mean phase shift (dashed line) as function of energy for a Hubbard model with next-neighbor hopping  $t=1$ , coupling  $U=5$  and  $\epsilon_F = 2.3$  in 2D, for a fixed total momentum  $P=(0.28; 0.36)$ . The phase shifts have been calculated for a finite system with  $L=100$ . Each point  $(E)$  is obtained by averaging 50 phase shifts corresponding to eigenenergies near  $E$  (the dashed line connects these points as guide to the eye).
- Fig. 7 Phase angle for two particles with momenta  $k$  and  $k^0$  close to a common point of the Fermi surface, plotted for various fixed total momenta  $P = k + k^0$  as a function of the ratio  $|k^0 - k|/(P - 2k_F)$ . A quadratic  $\epsilon_k$  with a cutoff  $\epsilon_c = 10$ , and a constant coupling  $U=5$  has been used in this plot.