Correlations in one dimensional quantum impurity problems with an external eld.

F.Lesage, H.Saleur.

Department of Physics, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90089-0484 PACS: 71.10 Pm, 71.15 Cr, 72.10 Fk.

We study response functions of integrable quantum in purity problem s with an external eld at T = 0 using non perturbative techniques derived from the Bethe ansatz. We develop the rst steps of the theory of excitations over the new, eld dependent ground state, leading to renorm alized (or \dressed") form -factors. We obtain exactly the low frequency behaviour of the dynam ical susceptibility $^{00}(!)$ in the double well problem of dissipative quantum mechanics (or equivalently the anisotropic K ondo problem), and the low frequency behaviour of the AC noise $S_t(!)$ for tunneling between edges in fractional quantum H all devices. We also obtain exactly the structure of singularities in $^{00}(!)$ and $S_t(!)$. O ur results di er signi cantly from previous perturbative approaches.

1. Introduction.

O ne dimensional quantum impurity problems, which are of considerable physical importance, have recently been the subject of signi cant theoretical progresses based on their integrability. In particular, in a recent paper [1], we have shown how correlation functions at T = 0 and without an applied eld could be obtained ¹ using massless form-factors [2] [3]. As a result, the response function ⁽⁰⁾(!) in the double well problem of dissipative quantum mechanics [4] [5], and the frequency dependent conductance G (!) for tunneling between edges in $=\frac{1}{3}$ fractional quantum H all devices [6] [7] were obtained at T = 0 and without an applied eld. Quantities at nite temperature and with an applied eld are also of great interest, and potentially closer to experiments, but signi cantly more di cult to obtain, except for their DC component [8], [9].

In this paper, we address the case T = 0 but the applied eld non-zero (this eld we designate generically by V). We consider in particular (0) (!) in the double well problem with a bias (equivalently the anisotropic K ondo problem with a eld applied to the impurity), and the non-equilibrium noise S_t (!) for the tunneling current in the quantum H all e ect in the presence of an applied voltage [10][11].

The problem (and the origin of physically interesting phenomena) is that the applied eld changes the structure of the ground state. The new ground state (we refer to it as the Ferm i sea in what follows) can be obtained without much di culty from the massless basis of solitons, antisolitons and breathers with factorized scattering. It is simply made of right moving (R) solitons and left moving (L) antisolitons lling all rapidities up to a Ferm i value A. Excitations are obtained by adding particles and making holes in the sea. Due to the interacting nature of the theory, the scattering of these excitations will be di erent from the case V = 0: there is a \dressing" of the S-matrices coming from the Ferm i sea, a phenom enon largely sim ilar to the dressing observed in lattice regularizations [12]. To develop a form -factor approach for the com putation of correlations, we have then to com pute dressed form -factors: the matrix elements of physical operators between asymptotic states of the dressed excitations. This is a di cult problem, for technical reasons which will be explained later. Exact results can still be obtained how ever. Here, we study in details two questions which have been the subject of interest in the litterature: the low frequency behaviour of the response function in dissipative quantum mechanics and

 $^{^{1}}$ M ore precisely, with controlled accuracy all the way from small to large coupling.



Fig. 1: Multi-layered Ferm i sea, only antisolitons are led at T = 0.

the frequency dependent shot noise in the tunnelling H all problem [10], [11]. In addition, we will explore the possible existence of singularities at nite frequency in these quantities.

The ham iltonian for the models we study here is :

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-1}^{2} dx [8 g^{2} + \frac{1}{8 g} (\theta_{x})^{2}] + H_{B}: \qquad (1:1)$$

This is the standard Luttinger liquid bosonic ham iltonian with a term at the boundary x = 0 [13]. Both the impurity tunneling and the double well problem can be written into this form by standard manipulations. The boundary term depends on the problem, for the Halle ect it is :

$$H_{B} = e^{igV t} e^{i(0)=2} + e^{igV t} e^{i(0)=2}; \qquad (12)$$

and for dissipative quantum mechanics we have :

$$H_{B} = S_{+} e^{i (0)=2} + S e^{i (0)=2} + \frac{1}{2}S_{z}:$$
(1:3)

In (1.2) V is the voltage. The electron charge is set to e = 1, and the phases in the boundary (tunneling) term correspond to tunneling of Laughlin quasi-particles. In (1.3),

is the bias, and in this formulation, g = 1; 1=2 correspond respectively to the isotropic and Toulouse points. Let us recall that (1.3) describes also the anisotropic K ondo problem with a eld applied to the impurity.

It is sometimes more appealing physically to $\unfold" (1.2)$. Indeed, writing the eld as a sum of a left and a right moving part, the integral on [1;0] can be traded for an integral on [1;1], the ham iltonian acting only on right movers. The boundary term then becomes an impurity term with the replacement (0) ! 2_R (0).

Let us now de ne the quantities we will study in this language. For the impurity tunneling, we want to study the non-equilibrium quantum noise. In the four term inal geom etry (see g. 2), this noise has several components. For simplicity, we will discuss in this introduction the tunneling noise only. Calling I_{t} (t) the tunneling current, we consider:

$$S_{t}(!) = \int_{1}^{Z_{1}} dt e^{i!t} < fI_{t}(t); I_{t}(0)g > :$$
(1:4)

W ith respect to gure 2, the tunnelling current is de ned as $I_t(t) = j_R(0^+;t)$ $j_L(0;t)$.



Fig. 2: Four term in al system in the tunnelling = 1=3 Halle ect.

For dissipative quantum mechanics (or the anisotropic K ondo problem), the quantity we want to compute is the dynam ical succeptibility²:

C (t) =
$$\frac{1}{2} < [S_z(t); S_z(0)] >$$
 (1.5)

or its Fourier transform $^{00}(!)^{3}$ [4].

As described in [1] the ham iltonian with the boundary interaction (1.2) is better understood in the fram ework of the sine-G ordon theory. The idea is simple: if we add a cos (x) to the ham iltonian, then the resulting problem is known to be integrable, term this is the boundary sine G ordon m odel [14]. This m odel is conveniently addressed in the basis of solitons/antisolitons, breathers, where the bulk interaction reduces to factorized scattering encoded in an S m atrix. The boundary interaction in this basis is then described by a rejection matrix. In order to describe the problem s we want to study, we then let ! 0, to get a \m assless scattering" description of a free boson, which involves m assless

² W e use conventions in which h = 1 and the spins are norm alised to 1. ³ Our norm alization is ⁰⁰(!) = $\frac{R}{\frac{dt}{2}}e^{i!t}C$ (t).

particles still referred to as solitons/antisolitons and breathers. Again, the boundary is simply described by a relection matrix. A similar description works for (1.3).

Having this basis, it is well known how to compute the ground state particle densities by using the Bethe ansatz. Knowing this ground state, a naive approach to correlations would be to consider matrix elements 4 of the form :

$$_{1}^{1}, \dots, _{q} < _{1}, \dots, _{p} \mathcal{D} \mathcal{J}_{1}, \dots, _{q} > _{1}, \dots, _{q}$$
 (1.6)

where bra and ket stand for the (shifted) ground state plus som e excitations, and to com – pute (1.6) using crossing. There are however important di culties in this approach which have to do with the existence of interactions (ie a non trivial S-m atrix). A more natural, and physically appealing, way to proceed is to think in terms of dressed or renorm alised excitations over the ground state.

The idea again is simple, though technically still di cult: with the help of the Bethe equations it is possible to compute the dressed energy and dressed scattering matrix between excitations. Having these quantities, one can then try to write axiom s for the dressed form -factors, in analogy with the well known case when V = 0 [2], and then solve these axiom s (a crucial di erence is that in the present case, there is an energy scale V, and relativistic invariance is broken). Correlators will then follow by inserting a complete set of excitations between operators.

The paper is organized as follows : In the second section, we study the new ground state and the structure of excitations of the auxiliary ham iltonian :

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \int_{1}^{Z_{1}} dx \ [8 \ g^{2} + \frac{1}{8 \ g} (@_{x})^{2}] + \frac{V}{4} \int_{1}^{Z_{1}} @_{t} : \qquad (1:7)$$

This ham iltonian is related with the problem s of interest through simple manipulations described in the appendix, with the correspondence = gV for the dissipative quantum mechanics case.

In the third section we discuss in considerable details the physics at low energies. We show that it is described by an elective free-ferm ion theory with renormalized parameters. We also discuss the physics near the thresholds of various excitation processes, laying the ground for further discussion of the singularities.

⁴ Here, as in our previous works, we norm alize asymptotic states such that $\langle j^0 \rangle = 2$ (⁰).

The low frequency behaviour being completely under control, we are then able to obtain some exact results as !! 0. In the fourth section we discuss the behaviour of the dynam ical succeptibility in the double well problem (or the anisotropic K ondo problem), and we obtain a closed expression for $\lim_{e \to 1} \frac{\infty}{e}$ as a function of V (recall = gV, the bias). We prove that Shiba's relation [15] [16]:

$$\lim_{! \to 0} \frac{1}{!} = 2g_0^2 \qquad (1.8)$$

holds for system with bias also⁵. A closed expression of $_0$ follows, which can be expanded as a series in $\frac{2}{V^2(1-g)}$ at large voltage (sm all coupling), and in powers of $\frac{V}{1-1-g}$ at sm all voltage (large coupling). There is in particular a universal product involving sm all and large voltage properties of the static succeptibility $_0$:

where the function F is given explicitly in the text.

These behaviours can be veri ed num erically using the fram ework of the Num erical Renorm alisation G roup m ethod (NRG) [17] which is very precise, and indeed the large eld exponent found there is in agreem ent [18] with the previous result. They could possibly also be checked using m onte carlo simulations [19], and m aybe experim entally. Early results on $^{00}(!)$, without bias, were also found in [20] using sum rules and scaling argum ents.

In the ffh section we discuss the noise in the tunneling problem . We obtain in particular the results :

$$\lim_{\substack{! \ ! \ 0}} \frac{S_{t}(!)}{!} = \frac{g}{!}; V << T_{B}$$

$$\lim_{\substack{! \ ! \ 0}} \frac{S_{t}(!)}{!} = K \frac{g}{!} V^{4} \frac{4=g}{!}; V >> T_{B}:$$
(1:10)

Expressions for the various components of the noise in the four term inalgeometry as well as the noise in the total current are also obtained.

In sections 4 and 5 we also discuss the existence of potential singularities, restricting to 1=g an integer strictly larger than 2. We nd that ⁽⁰⁾(!) as well as $S_t(!)$ should have singularities at all values ! = ngV, n an integer. We show that the rst singularity is a discontinuity in the rst order derivative, is of the form j! gV j (recall = gV). We argue that the other singularities should be of the same form : j! ngV j although we cannot completely prove it. A llof these singularities disappear when g = 1=2 where ^{$(0)} is regular, while <math>S_t(!)$ has a weaker residual singularity at ! = V, of the form $j! V j^3$.</sup></sup>

 $^{^5}$ N ote that this di ers from the usual relation 00 =! = 2 g $_0^2$ because of the norm alisations of the spins S_z to one and a factor 2 $\,$ in the de nition of the Fourier transform .

2. The Ferm i sea and the structure of excitations at T = 0.

For both problem s, some simple manipulations (see the appendix) lead rst to the consideration of the bulk ham iltonian :

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \int_{1}^{Z_{1}} dx [8 g^{2} + \frac{1}{8 g} (0_{x})^{2}] + \frac{V}{4} \int_{1}^{Z_{1}} 0_{t}; \qquad (2:1)$$

where V is the voltage in the FQHE and = gV for DQM (or AK). The e ect of the impurity is then encoded into scattering matrices as explained in sections 3 and 4.

2.1. The Ferm i sea

At T = 0, in the presence of a voltage, the ground state is factorized into a Left and a R ight Ferm i seas. M oreover, working at zero temperature allows an analytical solution of the B ethe equations because they become linear. Restricting to right m overs, the sea is m ade of solitons lling rapidities 2 (1; A] - this was discussed in [7] to which we refer extensively in the following. Note that all the results of this section will apply to left m overs as well after substituting antisolitons for solitons (since the Q_t term switches sign in (2.1)).

In [7] the Ferm i rapidity, A, is computed :

$$e^{A} = \frac{V}{2} \frac{G_{+}(0)}{G_{+}(1)}$$
: (2.2)

In this form ula, conventions are such that V=2, is the energy shift of solitons/antisolitons due to the voltage. We also de ne the \charge" of solitons and antisolitons to be 1^{6} . The kernelG is de ned by :

$$G_{+}(!) = \frac{r}{\frac{2}{g}} \frac{[i\frac{1}{2(1-g)}]}{(i\frac{1}{2(1-g)})(\frac{1}{2}-i\frac{1}{2})} e^{i!} ; \qquad (2:3)$$

where :

$$= \frac{g}{2(1 g)} \ln g + \frac{1}{2} \ln (1 g);$$

and we de ne G $(!) = G_+ (!)$.

⁶ It is also convenient to de ne their \spin" to be $\frac{1}{g}$. Both are proportional to the conserved topological charge of the ham iltonian. See the appendix for more details.

In the following, we shall repeatedly encounter the equation :

with the (soliton-soliton) phase shift () = $\frac{1}{2i} \frac{d}{d} \ln S$ () :

$$() = \int_{1}^{Z_{1}} e^{i!} \frac{\sinh\left(\frac{2g}{2(1-g)}\right)!}{2\cosh\frac{1}{2}\sinh\frac{g!}{2(1-g)}} \frac{d!}{2}:$$
(2:5)

As shown in [7], the function f which solves this has Fourier transform :

$$f'(!) = \frac{1}{2i}G (!)e^{i!A} \int_{1}^{Z_{1}} \frac{g(!)G_{+}(!)e^{-i!A}}{!O_{+}(!)G_{+}(!)}d!O_{+}^{0} (2:6)$$

where $g(!) = \frac{R_A}{1} g()e^{i!} d$. A retexample of equation (2.4) is provided by the density of solitons in the Ferm i sea which satisfies (recall the convention h = 1):

$$\begin{array}{c} Z_{A} \\ + () \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ (1; A]; \\ + = 0; \\ \end{array} \right) + (^{0}) d^{0} = \frac{e}{2};$$

$$(2:7)$$

Using (2.6) one nds:

$$+ () = \frac{V}{2^{P} - (1 - g)} \prod_{n=1}^{M} \frac{()^{n}}{n!} \frac{\exp [2n(1 - g)(A -)]}{(ng) - \frac{3}{2} - n(1 - g)};$$
 (2.8)

for 2 (1; A [, and _ = 0 outside the sea. The density _ is discontinuous at the Ferm i rapidity = A : one has $\lim_{a \to a} p = \frac{v}{4} p = \frac{1}{2g}$.

Sim ilarly, the density of holes of solitons above the Ferm i sea obeys :

$${}^{h}_{+}() = \frac{e}{2} + {}^{Z}_{A} ({}^{0})_{+} ({}^{0})d^{0}; > A:$$
 (2:9)

This density is the analytic continuation of $_{+}$ beyond the Ferm i rapidity. It is sometimes convenient to introduce a single, analytic quantity () such that $=_{+}$ in the Ferm i sea, and $=_{+}^{h}$ outside the Ferm i sea. Sim ilar equations can be written for the densities of holes of antisolitons h and holes of breathers $^{h}_{n}$, both quantities which are dened on the entire rapidity interval 2 (1;1).

2.2. Low energy excitations

Let us now come to the low energy excitations of the theory at zero temperature. A swe will show, when there is a voltage, there is a minimal amount of energy needed to create a particle or a hole: The voltage (or bias) introduces a scale in the theory, and we can look at low (compared with that scale) energy excitations.

The following processes are the low energy excitations, with their associated energies :

add a soliton: $_{+}$ (), 2]A ;1)

destroy a soliton (or create a hole): ${}^{\rm h}_+$ (), 2 (1 ; A [; ${}^{\rm h}_+$ gV.

The energy of hole and particle excitations can also be addressed analytically at zero tem perature. For example, the excitation energy for creating a hole in the sea, $^{h}_{+}$, obeys the equation :

$$\frac{V}{2} = \begin{pmatrix} & & & \\ & + & \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & &$$

with of course $_{+}^{h}()$ 0 for < A and $_{+}^{h}(A) = 0$ (this condition being actually the way of determining the Fermi rapidity (2.2)). By dimensional with respect to one sees that $\frac{d}{d} _{+}^{h}() = 2 _{+}()$. Explicit solution gives :

$${}^{h}_{+}() = \frac{V p}{2} g_{n=1}^{X} \frac{(1)^{n}}{n!} \frac{\exp [2n(1 g)(A)]}{(1 ng) \frac{3}{2} n(1 g)} + V g:$$
(2:11)

the constant term in (2.11) is equal to $^{h}_{+}$ (1), which can be obtained straightforwardly from (2.10) since in that lim it this becomes a simple convolution equation.

For > A, $^{h}_{+}$ as de ned above vanishes exactly. The excitation energy to add a soliton above the Ferm i sea can be shown to obey :

$$_{+}() = e \quad \frac{V}{2} \quad \begin{bmatrix} Z \\ A \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (\quad {}^{0}) \stackrel{h}{_{+}} (\; {}^{0}) d \; {}^{0}; \qquad (2:12)$$

and thus it is the analytic continuation of $\begin{array}{c} h \\ + \end{array}$ beyond the Ferm irapidity. Using the above determ ination of $\begin{array}{c} h \\ + \end{array}$ one nds explicitely :

$$+ () = e \quad \frac{V}{2} + \frac{V}{4} p - \frac{X^{1}}{n!} \frac{(1)^{n}}{n!} \frac{1}{\cos n - \frac{(1-g)}{g}} \frac{e^{n} p - \frac{2n(1-g)}{g}}{(1-n-g) - \frac{3}{2} + \frac{n(1-g)}{g}} : (2:13)$$

A sbefore, we de ne an analytic quantity which is equal to $\frac{h}{+}$ in the sea and $_+$ outside the sea.

As an example, let us prove (2.12). Call the density of solitons in the sea and $_{p}$ the density of solitons above the sea (often referred to in what follows as particles). If we add a few solitons at rapidities $_{1}$;:::; $_{N}$, we induce a change of density above the sea, $_{p}(_{p}) = \frac{1}{L} P_{i}(_{p})$, as well as a change of densities in the sea through the Bethe equations. The quantity we are looking for obeys, by de nition :

$$E = L _{A} + (p) p(p) dp; \qquad (2:14)$$

while on the other hand :

$$E = L \qquad e \qquad \frac{V}{2} \qquad ()d + L \qquad e^{p} \qquad \frac{V}{2} \qquad p(p)d_{p}: \qquad (2:15)$$

7

From the Bethe equations one has :

Let us write the solution of the general equation (2.4) as :

$$f() = \int_{1}^{2} \left[(0) + L(; 0) \right] g(0) d^{0}; \qquad (2:17)$$

where the kernel L is a symmetric function of its two arguments, and its exact expression is not needed in what follows. Solving (2.16) for and replacing in (2.15) leads to :

$$+ () = e \quad \frac{V}{2} + \frac{Z}{1} \qquad (\qquad 0) \qquad [(\ 0 \qquad 0) + L (\ 0 ; \ 0)] e \qquad \frac{V}{2} \quad d \qquad 0 : \qquad (2:18)$$

Equation (2.12) follows then from (2.10).

The corresponding analysis for the m on entum presents a subtlety. The reason is, that the m on entum of excitations does not vanish at the Ferm i velocity, as can easily be seen with the example of free ferm ions (g = 1=2). Therefore, one has to be very careful with what happens right at the Ferm i surface – this di culty did not appear for the energy because vanishes at the Ferm i surface anyway. We will discuss the dressed m on entum in m ore details in the next section. O fcourse, the nalresult can be predicted on physical grounds: excitations have to be relativistic, as they obviously are in the g = 1=2 case. Indeed, adding a potential V am ounts (in the bulk) to shifting Q_t by a constant, and this does not change the fact that excitations have a relativistic spectrum -m ore precisely, for excitations that have asm any particles as holes, m on entum = energy, while for non-neutral ones, m on entum = energy + constant.

In the following we de ne $p_+ = +$ and $p_+^h = +$

W hile at zero tem perature, there are only solitons, antisolitons as well as breathers do contribute to the excitation spectrum, as we now discuss.

2.3. O ther excitations

O ther excitations occur at a nite energy above the ground state (for g < 1) and are obtained by the following processes:

add a antisoliton: (), 2(1;1); (1 g)V.

add an n-breather: $_n$ (), 2 (1 ;1); $_n$ ngV

For adding a antisoliton one nds that the excitation energy is () = V + + () if > A and () = V + + () if < A. In particular, since the maximum energy for a hole is $_{+}^{h}(1) = gV$, we see that the threshold to add a soliton is (1 - g)V. This implies in particular that the low energy processes studied above must have an energy ! << (1 - g)V, and that the lim it g = 1 is highly singular in this approach. Similarly, these low energy processes must have an energy ! << gV, and the lim it g = 0 is also singular.

D i erent physical processes can therefore occur in the excitations, which have di erent thresholds. The structure of these thresholds is quite intricate for g arbitrary. In what follows, we shall restrict to the usual case $g = \frac{1}{t}$, t an integer. Then the thresholds occur at energy values $\frac{p}{t}V$, is all multiples of gV.

2.4. Charge dressing

It is also interesting to consider the charge of excitations. Suppose we destroy a soliton at rapidity in the sea. We denote the dressed charge q_{\pm}^{h} () = $2\frac{d}{dV} + 7^{h}$. It is therefore the solution of the equation similar to $\frac{h}{+}$ () (2.10), but with the left hand side $\frac{V}{2}$ ereplaced by the opposite of the charge of the bare solitons:

$$1 = q_{\pm}^{h} () \qquad ()^{0} q_{\pm}^{h} ()^{0} d^{0} : \qquad (2:19)$$

This is actually related to other quantities we already computed in the sea: $\frac{V}{2}q_{+}^{h}() = 2_{+}() + \frac{h}{4}()$, from which follows the renorm alized charge of the excitations at the Ferm isurface :

$$q_{\pm}^{h}(A) = q_{\pm}(A) = \frac{p}{2g};$$
 (2.20)

where we used above values of (A). In (2.20), q is similarly the value of the dressed charge for an antisoliton added above the Ferm i surface. Of course, breathers have a vanishing dressed charge.

⁷ This de nition is adequate only near the Ferm i rapidity.

3. Physics at low energy.

3.1. D ressed scattering

W hile excitations have a relativistic dispersion relation, relativistic invariance is broken by the existence of the energy scale e^A . The next question is then, what sort of relativistic theory is that? To nd out, we must determ ine the corresponding S m atrix. First, som e technicalities. Introduce the functional \hat{K} such that :

$$\vec{K}$$
 f() = (⁰)f(⁰)d⁰

and sim ilarly :

$$\hat{I} f() = f()$$

Then (2.4) reads $(\hat{I} \times \hat{K}) = g$, and the general solution (2.17) reads in those terms :

$$(\hat{I} + \hat{L}) (\hat{I} \quad \hat{K}) = \hat{I}$$

or equivalently $(\hat{I} + \hat{L})\hat{K} = \hat{L}$. This means in turn that :

$$\begin{bmatrix} Z_{A} & & Z_{A} & & Z_{A} \\ & & [(& 0) + L (; 0)] d^{0} & (& 0 & \infty) f (& 0) d^{00} \\ & & & 1 \\ & & & 1 \\ & & & Z_{A} \\ & & = & L (; 0) f (& 0) d^{0} \\ & & & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Since this is true for any function f we deduce the identity :

$$Z_{A} = [(0) + L (; 0)] (0 0) d^{0} = L (; 0) :$$
(3:1)

Let us now consider the quantization equation allowing a few particles and holes. One has

$$Z (+ ^{h}) () = e + 2 \qquad (^{0}) (^{0}) d ^{0} + (^{0}) p (^{0}) d ^{0}: (32)$$

Let us now transform this equation to make sense in the dressed theory [21]. In this theory, the excitations are still particles above the sea, but they are holes in the sea. Therefore, the dressed equations must have on the right hand side not $\,_{\rm h}$, but rather $_{\rm h}$. A fler som e manipulations using the foregoing technical indentities, we obtain

$$2 (+ ^{h})() = 2 _{+} 2 _{-1} L(; ^{0}) ^{h}() ^{0}d ^{0} + 2 _{-1} L(; ^{0}) _{p}() ^{0}d ^{0}: (3:3)$$

The rst term in this equation must be identied with the derivative of the dressed momentum of holes, is one has $\frac{d}{d}p_{+}^{h}() = 2_{+}()$. But it is easy to see that this equals in turn $\frac{d}{d}$, proving as claimed in the previous section that hole excitations have a dispersion relation of the form momentum = energy + constant. The two other terms must be identied with the dressed scattering, and therefore we have ⁸.

$$\frac{1}{2i} \frac{d}{d^{0}} \ln S_{hh} (; ^{0}) = L (; ^{0})$$

$$\frac{1}{2i} \frac{d}{d^{0}} \ln S_{hp} (; ^{0}) = L (; ^{0}):$$
(3:4)

Sim ilarly we have

$$\frac{1}{2i} \frac{d}{d^{0}} \ln S_{pp} (; ^{0}) = L (; ^{0})$$

$$\frac{1}{2i} \frac{d}{d^{0}} \ln S_{ph} (; ^{0}) = L (; ^{0});$$
(3.5)

together with $\frac{d}{d}p_+$ () = 2 $\frac{h}{+}$ () = $\frac{d}{d}$ + (), proving that particle excitations are also relativistic.

To determ ine completely the S-m atrix, one has to nd out the constants of integration. This is a question that is not directly answered by the Bethe ansatz. U sually, these constants would be determ ined by using relativistic invariance, is requiring that the full S m atrix depends only on the di erence of rapidities [12]. Here however, relativistic invariance is broken, and the S m atrix has a m ore complicated dependence on these rapidities. To compute the constants, one needs to reform ulate the equivalent of crossing and unitarity in the dressed theory with broken relativistic invariance. Here we shall contend ourselves with an analysis of the low energy excitations, near the Ferm i rapidity. As ! A, the energy scale V becomes unimportant because $\langle \langle V, =V \rangle$ 0, and relativistic invariance is restored. Then, L (; ⁰) can be approximated by L (A; A), and integration of (3.4) and (3.5) combined with unitarity leads to the simplest solution:

$$S_{ph}(p; h) = \exp [2i L(A;A)(p h)]$$

$$S_{hp}(h; p) = \exp [2i L(A;A)(p p)]$$

$$S_{pp}(p; p) = \exp [2i L(A;A)(p p)]$$

$$S_{hh}(h; h) = \exp [2i L(A;A)(p p)]$$
(3:6)

⁸ In fact, the follow ing relations hold only for $< 0^{\circ}$, since the relation between the S m atrix and the phase shift depends on which particle has the largest rapidity

The overall m inus sign here is necessary to ensure that no two particles or holes can coincide 9 . Let us stress that (3.6) is, due to the problem of integration constants, partly a conjecture, which we will check carefully in particular in the next subsection. For a more complete discussion of (3.6), see the next paper [22]

For low energy excitations above the sea, this elective theory represented by (3.6) is simply a free ferm ion theory: the additional phase shifts being of the form exp[i cst(0)] amount to a simple gauge transform ation and can be gauged away (alternatively, form – factors for (3.6) are free ferm ion form –factors, up to phases that cancelout in the correlators of interest). W ithout the sea, if one looks at say the bare S matrix of solitons, it does not have a well de ned lim it at very low energy, ie when both rapidities approach minus in nity, because by relativistic invariance it depends on the ratio of these energies e 1 =e 2 . The role of the sea is to give the dressed S matrix a well de ned lim it at very low energy, ie when both rapidities approach A. It is then very natural that the lim iting theory should be a theory of free ferm ions.

In subsequent computations, it will be useful to introduce the shift function. For example, suppose we add a soliton above the sea at rapidity $_{\rm p}$ and create a hole in the sea at rapidity $_{\rm h}$. This induces a shift of the rapidities in the sea: a rapidity equal to initially becomes + ⁽²⁾ with the conditions:

$$I = \frac{1}{2}Le + \frac{1}{2i}X \ln S ()$$

$$I = \frac{L}{2}e^{+(2)} + \frac{1}{2i}X \ln S (+ (2)) (2)) (3:7)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2i}\ln S (p) \frac{1}{2i}\ln S (h):$$

A susual we de ne the shift function by L $_+$ () ⁽²⁾ F (j_p ; h). By standard manipulations, one nds the equation obeyed by the shift:

$$\frac{1}{2i} [\ln S(_{h}) \ln S(_{p})] = F(_{j_{p}; h}) (^{0})F(_{j_{p}; h})d^{0}: (3:8)$$

A form al solution of this equation follows as :

$$F(j_{p}; h) = \int_{h}^{p} L(j^{0}) d :$$
 (3:9)

⁹ The sign of S at identical rapidities is a subject of som e discussion, and largely dependent on the way the S m atrix is de ned. For us, S is the object appearing in the Fateev Zam olodchikov algebra.

3.2. The noise at low energy in a pure Luttinger liquid

To verify the consistency of our low-energy approach, let us consider the current noise in a Luttinger liquid with a voltage and in the absence of in purity. Let us work within the elective theory of low energy excitations. In doing so, we forget completely about the Ferm i sea and concentrate on the excitations. Let us write their energies and momentum e = p << V. It is convenient here to introduce new rapidities such that for particles $_{+}(p) = e^{p}$ and for holes $_{+}^{h}(p) = e^{h}$. Consider then the renormalized current operator where the vacuum expectation value has been subtracted. For a free Ferm ion theory one has:

<
$$0j: @_{z} : (0; 0) j_{1}; _{2} > _{+} = ce^{1^{-2}}e^{2^{-2}}$$

< $0j: @_{z} : (0; 0) j_{1}; _{2} > _{+} = ce^{1^{-2}}e^{2^{-2}};$ (3:10)

where all the particles are assumed to be right moving, we changed notation to call a particle + and a hole , and c is a constant to be determined. To x the normalization c of this form -factor, let us consider the charge of the one particle state

$$Z_{1}$$

$$= dx : (x;t) j_{2} > +$$

$$Z_{1}$$

$$= dx < 0j: (0, 0) j_{1} \quad i; 2 > + exp[i(x t)(e_{2} e_{1})]$$

$$= 2 ice \frac{(1 2)}{de=d}$$

$$= 2 \frac{p}{2g} (1 2);$$
(3:11)

where the last equality is imposed using the foregoing dressed charge computation. It follows that $c = \frac{p}{2g}$. Hence at coupling g, all what di ers from the g = 1=2 case is a renorm alization of the two-particle form factor by $\frac{p}{2g}$. The computation of the correlator is then the same as for the free ferm ions, up to a renorm alization by $(\frac{p}{2g})^2$ since the two point function of the current involves the squares of form -factors. We not then the noise at low energy :

$$S(!) = \frac{g}{2} j! j;$$
 (3:12)

in agreem ent with the well known exact result.

Let us stress that this little computation is actually a non trivial check. In general, and for vanishing voltage, the norm alization of the two particle form -factor can be determ ined by imposing the value of the charge. W hen one computes the contribution of this two particle form -factor to the two point function of the current, it appears that some contributions are m issing, due to higher form -factors: in other words higher form -factors are needed without voltage because the charge of excitations is 1 while the two point function has am plitude 2g. W ith a voltage, things are completely di erent, because the dressed charge is $p_{\overline{2g}}$, so the (free) two-particle form -factor is su cient to reproduce the two-point function am plitude. Let us stress also that there is no way one can reproduce the V = 0 case by taking a \lim it" V ! 0. In a massless theory, there is no such thing as a low energy scale.

4. Thresholds and potential singularities

As explained earlier, the interacting theory presents a series of thresholds : physical processes become allowed or forbidden when ! crosses one of the values ! = ngV . W ithout an impurity, none of these values does actually lead to a singularity in the noise, since the form ula $S = \frac{g}{j}$ j! jholds. W hat takes place are very special cancellations, which generally will be spoilt by the impurity. A simple example to see the phenomenon is the free fermions g = 1=2. Consider the noise close to the threshold $! = gV = \frac{V}{2}$. For $! < \frac{V}{2}$, the only allowed physical process is the creation of a particle hole pair. U sing that the form factor is $e^{1=2}e^{2=2}$ one can write :

$$Z_{V=2} Z_{1}$$

$$de_{1} de_{2} (! e_{1} e_{2}) = de_{1} = !; ! < V=2$$

$$Z_{V=2}^{0} = de_{1} = V=2; ! > V=2;$$

where we used that for any e_1 in the interval [0; V=2], $! e_1 > 0$ in the second case. Of course when ! > V=2, another process is possible beside exciting a particle from the sea, it is the creation of a pair soliton-antisoliton. The threshold for creating an antisoliton is at V=2, and the form factor is the same so one has then :

$$Z_{1} Z_{1}$$

 $de_{1}de_{2}$ (! $e_{1} e_{2}$) = Z_{1}
 $v=2$ $de_{1} = \frac{V}{2}$!;

and this second process adds up to the previous one to reproduce the ! dependence at all values of !. Hence there is no singularity because the term involving solitons produces an analytic continuation of the term involving a hole.

Since we know there is no singularity in the noise, in the absence of in purity, for any frequency, this means that sim ilar cancellations must take place between various contributions around a given threshold. For instance, $\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \end{pmatrix} V = \frac{t-1}{t}V$ is the threshold at which

soliton creation is possible, while it is the maximum energy one can reach by creating (t 1) holes in the sea, etc.

Let us now investigate in m ore details the potential singularity at $!_c = gV$, assuming $g < \frac{1}{2}$. At this frequency, the process involving a pair particle hole saturates while the process involving creation of a (rst) breather above the Ferm i sea kicks in. Let us consider in m ore details the process involving a breather above the Ferm i sea. Once again, we will restrict to low energies that is to frequencies such that $j! !_c j < !_c$. In that lim it, the breathers are created at rapidities close to 1, and in all the computations determ ining the phase shifts and the dressed S-m atrix, one can replace the integrals on [1;A] by integrals over the whole real axis. The renorm alized breather-breather S-m atrix is then found to be :

$$\frac{1}{2i} \frac{d}{d} \ln S_{bb} = {}_{11} + \frac{{}_{1}^{2}}{1}; \qquad (4:1)$$

(where the right hand side is understood in terms of Fourier transform s, $_{11}$ and $_{1}$ are dened like as the logarithm ic derivatives of the breather-breather and breather-soliton S-m atrices), and this simply reproduces $_{11}$ up to a rapidity renorm alization. Hence, the renorm alized scattering theory for breathers close to 1 is insensitive to the voltage, and behaves like an ordinary sine-G ordon model. Setting :

$$_{\rm b}() = gV + e;$$
 (4.2)

the form factor of the current can depend only on e, and by dimensional analysis, must simply be proportional to e. Hence the leading contribution to the noise without in purity of the breather term is :

$$A_{b} = e^{2} + e^{2} + e^{2} = A_{b} + e^{2} + e^{2} = A_{b} + e^{2} + e^{2} = A_{b} + e^{2} + e^{2$$

where A_b is an amplitude we did not determ ine here. Sim ilarly let us consider the particle hole term. Calling f(1; 2) the form factor of the current between the Ferm i sea and a state with a hole at 1 < A and an added particle at 2 > A, the contribution to the noise is proportional to :

$$\begin{bmatrix}
 Z_{A} & Z_{1} \\
 d_{1} & d_{2} \neq (1; 2)^{2} \\
 1 & A
 \end{bmatrix}
 + (2) + (1) : (4:4)$$

Perform ing the $_2$ integral gives, for ! < !_c :

$$\sum_{\substack{(h) \\ (+) \end{pmatrix}^{-1}(!)} f(1;2) \int_{-\pm}^{2} \frac{1}{(2)} d_{1}; \quad 2 = (+)^{-1} (! \quad \frac{h}{+} (1));$$
 (4:5)

while for $! > !_c$, the integral runs from 1 to A instead, with ${}^{h}_{+}(1) = !_c$. Hence the contributions of the particle hole term below and above $!_c$ dier by the integral from 1 to ${\binom{h}{+}}^{-1}(!)$ of the same integrand as in (4.5).

Now, for $!_{c}$, the values of $_{1}$ and $_{2}$ are very far apart: $_{2}$ A, a nite rapidity, while $_{1}$ approaches the value 1. At leading order, jf $(_{1};_{2})^{2} =_{\pm} (_{2})$ must then factorize into a function of $_{1}$: f $(_{1})$, and a function of A. Setting :

$${}^{h}_{+}(1) = {}^{l}_{c} e^{1}; (4.6)$$

we trade $_1$ for $_1$. By dimensional analysis, and one has f ($_1$) / e $_1^{=2}$, so introducing the variable $x = e^{-1}$, the contribution to the noise without in purity of the particle hole term part can be rewritten, in addition to a regular term, as :

$$Z_{!_{c}}$$

 A_{ph} $dx = A_{ph}$ (!_c !);! < !_c (4:7)

 A_{ph} being another am plitude. The two processes which \cross" at !_c behave both linearly in ! !_c at leading order (there are no other processes near !_c, and we discuss only the leading singularities). Since the noise has no singularity in the absence of impurity, this means that (4.3) must be the analytic continuation of (4.7), that is $A_{b} = A_{ph}$.

For $!_c = ngV;n$ 2, there are in addition background processes, that is processes present on both sides of $!_c$. We shall assume that such processes do not have singular behaviours – equivalently that the form factors of the renormalized theory are regular around $!_c$.

Then, for $!_c = 2gV$, we have the one second-breather process for $! > !_c$, the two particles – two holes process for $! < !_c$: the previous analysis thus generalizes to this case.

For $!_c = ngV; n > 2$, m one than two processes usually cross, m aking the analysism one di cult: for instance for ! = 3gV, the one third-breather process together with the three one-breather process are possible for $! > !_c$. The absence of singularity for the noise of the pure system therefore does not completely constrain the amplitudes as was the case for $!_c = gV$.

We now apply the above considerations to the two problems of physical interest.

5. Properties of the response function in the two-state problem.

5.1. Low frequency behaviour.

As a rst application, we consider the low energy behaviour of the response function in the two-state problem with a bias V .

In the presence of a boundary interaction we have several energy scales: T_B ; !; V. The function $\frac{O(!)}{!}$ can be written as $\frac{1}{T_B^2}$ times a function F_{V} ; $\frac{T_B}{V}$. We will be able to use the foregoing low-energy scattering theory of excitations above the Ferm isea provided we restrict to ! << V : that is only the dependence of F on the rst variable will be accessible. Observe this is enough to obtain the value $\lim_{s \to 0} F$.

At low energy, the only physical processes involve R-solitons and L-antisolitons. The boundary interaction is then fully characterized by the relection matrix R^+ - in this paragraph we shallom it the isotopic indices from now on. In the presence of the boundary, the ground state becomes :

It is a mixture of left and right particles $[1](eg jj > = j >^{R} + R j >^{L})$. The rapidities are the same as was discussed in section 2 because there is no LR scattering.

The low energy results are obtained by making a particle-hole pair $_{p}$; h, with the remaining rapidities being shifted. For the current-current correlator, this gives :

$$<_{n;} _{1} j j R j j 1; ..., h; ..., n; p > <_{p; n}; ..., h; ..., j j L j 1; ..., n > =$$

$$R ...R <_{n;} _{1} j R j 1; ..., h; ..., n; p > R ...R$$

$$L ...L <_{p; n}; ..., h; ..., j J L j 1; ..., n > L ...L R (p) R (i)$$

$$I ...L <_{p; n}; ..., h; ..., j J L j 1; ..., n > L ...L R (p) R (i)$$

$$I ...L <_{p; n}; ..., h; ..., j J L j 1; ..., n > L ...L R (p) R (i)$$

$$I ...L <_{p; n}; ..., h; ..., j J L j 1; ..., n > L ...L R (p) R (i)$$

$$I ...L <_{p; n}; ..., h; ..., j J L j 1; ..., n > L ...L R (p) R (i)$$

$$I ...L <_{p; n}; ..., h; ..., j J L j 1; ..., n > L ...L R (p) R (i)$$

$$I ...L <_{p; n}; ..., h; ..., j J L j 1; ..., n > L ...L R (p) R (i)$$

$$I ...L <_{p; n}; ..., h; ..., j J L j 1; ..., n > L ...L R (p) R (i)$$

$$I ...L <_{p; n}; ..., h; ...,$$

where the hat denotes the om itted (hole) rapidity. Observe that (5.2) involves the same m atrix elements as for the excitations in the bulk, to which the analysis of section 3 applies. As for the $J_L J_L$ and $J_R J_R$ correlators, they are not a ected by the boundary interaction. U sing the fact that $R = R^{-1}$ and inserting $R_{-h}(R_{-h}) = 1$, we not that we can express these rejection matrices in terms of a renormalised rejection matrix for the particles and holes :

$$\begin{array}{c} ({}_{Z_{A}} \\ R(_{p})R(_{h}) ! exp \\ \\ 1 \end{array} \left[F(j_{h}) F(j_{p}) \right] \frac{d}{d} \ln R() R(_{p})R(_{h}) : (5:3)$$

It is then convenient to introduce a renorm alized re ection m atrix :

$$R() = R() \exp \left[F(^{0}j) \frac{d}{d^{0}} \ln R(^{0}) \right]$$
(5:4)

U sing the same line of arguments as in [1], one can write rerwrite 00 in terms of the correlator of the current operator. The latter can then be expressed through form -factors. One nds:

$${}^{00}(!) = \frac{1}{2g^{2}!^{2}} \operatorname{Re} \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ d_{2} d_{2} & P_{2} \\ 1 \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ d_{2} d_{2} & P_{2} \\ 1 \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ d_{2} & P_{2} \\ 1 \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ d_{2} & P_{2} \\ 1 \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \\ 1 \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \\ 1 \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \\ 1 \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \\ 1 \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \\ 1 \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \\ 1 \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \\ 1 \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \\ 1 \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \\ 1 \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \\ 1 \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \\ 1 \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \\ 1 \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \\ 1 \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \\ 1 \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \\ 1 \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \\ 1 \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \\ 1 \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \\ 1 \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \\ 1 \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \\ 1 \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \\ 1 \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \\ 1 \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \\ 1 \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \\ 1 \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \\ 1 \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \\ 1 \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \\ 1 \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \\ 1 \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \\ 1 \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \\ 1 \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \\ 1 \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} & P_{2} \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{2} \end{array} \right] \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_{\ln !} \\ D_{$$

where we have de ned the ! correspondence through ${}^{h}_{+}({}_{2}) = e^{2}$ and ${}_{+}({}^{0}_{2}) = e^{2}$. To clarify this, let us write the R part explicitly :

R
$$\begin{pmatrix} 0\\2 \end{pmatrix} = \frac{e^{\frac{0}{2}} + iT_{B}}{e^{\frac{0}{2}} iT_{B}} = \frac{e^{A} + e^{\frac{0}{2}} + iT_{B}}{e^{A} + e^{\frac{0}{2}} iT_{B}};$$

where :

$$= \frac{e^{A}}{2(A)} = \frac{P \frac{G_{+}(0)}{2gG_{+}(1)}};$$
(5:6)

(here we used 2 (A) = $\frac{d}{d}$ j) and sim ilarly :

R (2) =
$$\frac{e^{A}}{e^{A}}$$
 $\frac{e^{2}}{e^{2}}$ $\frac{iT_{B}}{e^{2}}$;

where the additionalm inus sign arises from the di erent hole/particle param etrization. In the foregoing equations, T_B is a renorm alized coupling, related with the bare coupling by [7]

$$g = 2 \sin(g) \frac{2^{g}}{4}$$
 (g) $2ge = \frac{G_{+}(i)}{G_{+}(0)} T_{B}$; (5:7)

where the expressions for G_+ and are given in section 2.1, is a cut-o. For simplicity, we usually use the variable T_B in the sequel.

The integral in (5.5) can then rewritten, setting e $\frac{2}{2}$ x :

(note the dependence on x ! instead of ! x for the same reason as above). O by iously this vanishes when ! = 0. Because jR f = 1, the term linear in ! vanishes too. At second order one would have : Z_{i}

$$\int_{0}^{\frac{d}{2}} \frac{d}{dx} \ln R \, dx$$

and this will not contribute when we take the real part because R is a pure phase. The imaginary part of this expression, though, contributes to the real part of the static spin-spin succeptibility = 0 + i 0 [1]. Its expression is given by :

$$\lim_{l \neq 0} {}^{0}(!) = {}_{0} = \frac{i}{2 {}^{2}g} e \frac{d}{d} \ln R () = {}_{A}$$
(5:9)

For $^{(0)}$, we not that the rst non trivial term goes like ! ³ as expected. Collecting all term s one nds :

$$\lim_{l \neq 0} \frac{\omega(l)}{l} = \frac{2}{4g^2} e \frac{d}{d} \ln R () = A^2 (5:10)$$

From these two previous expressions we can prove Shiba's relation in the presence of a bias:

$$\lim_{! \neq 0} \frac{\omega(!)}{!} = {}^{2}g {}^{2}_{0}; \qquad (5:11)$$

which is exactly the same as the one without $bias^{10}$.

In particular for g = 1=2 there is no renorm alization due to the sea, R () = R () = $\frac{e + iT_B}{e - iT_B}$ and thus, using $\frac{V}{2} = e^A$ in that case :

$$\lim_{\substack{! \ ! \ 0}} \frac{0}{\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{2}{2} \frac{T_{\rm B}^2}{\frac{V^2}{4} + T_{\rm B}^2};$$
(5:12)

in agreem ent with the exact result [23].

Let us rewrite (5.10) in a more explicit form :

$$\lim_{\substack{! \leq 0 \\ 1 \leq l \leq 0}} \frac{0}{l} (!) = \frac{2}{4g^2} e^{2A} \frac{1}{\cosh(A_B)} + \frac{Z_A}{1} \frac{d}{d} F(^{0}j) = \frac{1}{\cosh(^{0}B)} d^{0} :$$
(5:13)

Let us not investigate the behaviour as $V=T_B$! 0. At leading order the term in the bracket can be rewritten as :

$$\frac{2}{T_{B}} e^{A} + \sum_{i=1}^{Z_{A}} e^{O} \frac{d}{d} F(O_{j})_{j=A}$$

$$= \frac{2}{T_{B}} e^{A} + \sum_{i=1}^{Z_{A}} e L(i)$$

$$= \frac{4}{T_{B}} (A):$$

¹⁰ This relation di ers from the usual $\lim_{1 \le 0} 0^{0}$ (!)=! = 2 g $_{0}^{2}$ because of a di erent convention for Fourier transform s and spin norm alization.

where we used (2.7), (2.17), (3.9). Hence, at very sm all voltage one has :

$$\lim_{\substack{l \neq 0 \\ l \neq 0}} \frac{0}{l} \frac{0}{l} = \frac{2}{4g^2} \frac{1}{T_B^2} + \frac{4}{e^A} \frac{(A)}{e^A} = \frac{1}{g(T_B)^2};$$
(5:14)

This result is identical with the value of $\lim_{l \neq 0} \frac{\infty_{(l)}}{l}$ at vanishing voltage [1]. This proves that the limit ! 0 and V ! 0 commute, as seem s clear from the NRG method [17]. Notice that a priori this result is non trivial, the structure of excitations being very di erent at vanishing and non-vanishing voltage in a Luttinger liquid.

To obtain more insight in the behaviour of $\lim_{l \neq 0} \frac{\omega_{(l)}}{l}$, some transform ations are useful, which are related with the standard Bethe ansatz computation of the susceptibility.

5.2. Static succeptibility by the Bethe ansatz.

Since we nd a relation between $\lim_{l \to 0} \frac{0}{l}$ and the static susceptibility 0, we can perform a crucial check of our approach since 0 can be computed by other means. Indeed, the total spin succeptibility is simply a second derivative of the free energy with respect to V, and the free energy can be computed directly by the Bethe-ansatz.

By using standard manipulations for boundary theories (see eg [24]), we nd for the impurity part of the free energy at zero tem perature :

$$F_{imp} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{1}^{2} d \frac{d}{d} \ln R (B)_{+}^{h} ():$$
 (5:15)

The impurity susceptibility is then given by $_0 \qquad \frac{1}{2} \frac{d^2 F_{imp}}{d(-2)^2}$. It reads generally :

$$_{0} = \frac{1}{g^{2}} \frac{d}{d} \ln R (A) = \frac{1}{V} \frac{\frac{d}{d}}{\frac{d}{d}} \ln R (A) = \frac{1}{V} \frac{\frac{d}{d}}{\frac{d}{d}} \frac{h}{d} \ln R (A) = \frac{1}{V} \frac{\frac{d}{d}}{\frac{d}{d}} \ln R (A) = \frac{1}{V} \frac{\frac{d}{d}}{\frac{d}}{\frac{d}{d}} \ln R (A) = \frac{1}{V} \frac{\frac{d}{d}$$

where we used the correspondence = gV. Since $\frac{d}{d} \ln R$ () = $\frac{1}{\cosh}$, we see that this is almost in the same form as the previous expression (5.13) for $_0$. The exact correspondence can be established using :

$$\frac{Q_{+}^{h}()}{Q_{V}} = g + \frac{(_{+}^{h}() V_{g})}{V} \frac{Q_{+}^{h}()Q_{A}}{Q_{V}}$$
$$= \frac{_{+}^{h}()}{V} + \frac{2}{V} + ();$$

from which it follows that :

$$\frac{\frac{0}{4} + ()}{\frac{0}{2}} = A = \frac{p \frac{2g}{2g}}{2}:$$
(5:17)

Sim ilarly, simple manipulations using the L operator of sections 2 and 3 lead to the identity :

$$\frac{(2^{2} + (^{0}))}{(2^{2} + (^{0}))} = \frac{p}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{V} L(^{0}; A) = \frac{p}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{V} \frac{(2^{2} + (^{0}))}{(2^{2} + (^{0}))} = A$$
(5:18)

com pleting the proof of the identity.

From this discussion the static susceptibility, after a few manipulations, reads :

$$_{0} = \frac{2T_{B}}{g^{2}V^{2}} \int_{1}^{Z_{A}} d \frac{e}{\cosh(e_{B})^{2}} + (0) :$$
(5:19)

This expression is more convenient that the form-factors one of the previous section. In particular, using the Fourier representation of $,_0$ can be written as a convergent series. For sm allvoltage this series is in V=T_B (recall T_B / ^{1=1 g}): it corresponds to the approach of the IR xed point along the stress energy tensor. For large voltage, the series is in $(T_B = V)^{1-g}$, and corresponds to the (conform al) perturbation of the UV xed point. The leading term in that case is found to be

$${}_{0} ' \frac{2(1 g)}{p-g^{2}V} \frac{1}{(g) (g 1=2) \cos g} \frac{T_{B}}{e^{A+}} :$$
 (5.20)

By using the relation between $T_{\scriptscriptstyle B}\,$ and $\,$, this can be recast as

$$_{0}$$
, $\frac{2}{2}$ (3 2g) $_{2}$ (gV)^{2g 3}; (5:21)

in agreem ent with storder conform al perturbation theory.

The constant T_B can be easily eliminated to form universal amplitudes. For example, the large and low voltage results are related by the following universal product :

5.3. Singularities

W hen the impurity is present, the nely tuned cancellations killing o the singularities will be upset by dierent R-matrices terms. Let us see how this works in the double well problem.

Consider rst $!_c = gV$. Recall that in the absence of impurity, there was a ne cancellation between the particle-hole process below $!_c$ and the one-breather process above

it. In the presence of the impurity, consider not the particle-hole process. For the hole close to = 1, the relexion matrix is simply equal to one. There is no dressing elect because the only particles in the sea a lected by this hole are them selves at rapidities close to 1, where their R matrix is also unity. Hence the only part that sees the impurity is the particle close to the Ferm i rapidity. For this one we have the dressed R-matrix (5.4), so the particle hole process contributes to (0) (!) by a term proportional to :

$$("Z_{A} #)$$

A_{ph} R(A)exp dF(A) $\frac{d}{d}$ lnR() 1 (!_c !);! < !_c: (5:23)

At low voltage in particular this is proportional to $\frac{V}{T_{R}}$ (! c !).

The breather rejection matrix for $_{\rm b} = 1$ is equal to unity, so the breather process does not contribute linearly to $^{(0)}(!)$ around $!_{\rm c}$. Hence (5.23) is actually the whole leading behaviour close to $!_{\rm c}$, and there is now a singularity which we refer to as being of the type $j!_{\rm c}j$ (a discontinuity in the inst order derivative).

The same analysis can be carried out for the other processes. However, because several processes cross at $!_c = ngV; n > 2$, and there are more amplitudes than relations to x them, we cannot be as conclusive: the singularity will be of the type j! ngV junless some special cancellations occur, in which case it will be weaker.

6. The AC noise for tunneling in the fractional quantum Halle ect

6.1. Low frequency behaviour

The case of the FQHE is more complicated. In the dissipative quantum mechanics problem, the relection matrices are antidiagonal in the soliton/antisoliton basis. For the impurity problem this is no longer true: the relection matrix can connect a state consisting of all right-moving solitons to another in which there are left-moving solitons and antisolitons. W ithout a voltage, eigenstates obviously read :

$$jj > = j >^{R} + R()^{\circ} j >^{L}_{\circ} :$$
 (6:1)

At this stage, one must be very careful. We have argued before that in the presence of a voltage, solitons and antisolitons have di erent energies, so it would seem that (6.1) is not an eigenstate of the ham iltonian when V \leq 0. This conclusion is incorrect, for a subtle reason. The boundary sine-G ordon model must be thought of as an anisotropic

K ondo m odel with a special (cyclic) representation of SU $(2)_q$ at the boundary [25](or, m ore generally, a representation of the q-oscillator algebra" [26]). The additional degrees of freedom provided by this boundary spin must be included in the proper de nition of asym ptotic states, and in particular they reinstate spin (charge) conservation. At the end of the day, this auxiliary spin can be gauged away and the result is that one can, indeed, treat (6.1) as an eigenstate with the same energy as j > R. See the appendix for m ore details.

M ore general eigenstates are m ixtures of left and right m oving particles, which we denote :

In particular, the ground state gets m odi ed, the sea of solitons becom es a sea m ade of superpositions of solitons and antisolitons according to $j >_{+} ! j >_{+} = j >_{+}^{R} + P () j >^{L} + Q () j >^{L}_{+}, where we introduced the notation :$

$$R_{0} = \begin{array}{c} Q & P \\ P & Q \end{array} ; \qquad (6.2)$$

and the elements P;Q are given in [27]. W hen we compute the full current-current correlation function, di erent terms arise depending on the chirality of the J operators. They actually have di erent physical meanings, and we will treat them separately.

To understand the physical meaning of the di erent term s, let us stress again that the boundary formalism is fully equivalent to a formalism with only R movers scattered through an impurity. The R state in (6.1) can then be considered as an im R-state, and the L states in (6.1) as out R-states, with the same energy but possibly di erent quantum numbers. Formula (6.1) is thus a scattering eigenstate in the traditional sense, and the following computations are fully equivalent to Landauer-Buttiker scattering [28] as carried out in [11] for the particular case g = 1=2.

Let us nally emphasize that we are only concerned here with the ! dependent com - ponent of the noise: the DC noise (which has been already computed in [8]) is implicitly subtracted.

The rst term corresponds to $J_R J_R$. This term sees only the R-states in (6.1), and can be thought of as a noise purely in the im com ing channel: it is thus insensitive to the boundary interaction. One has, at coincident points :

$$S_{RR} = \frac{g}{2} j! j:$$
 (6:3)

The second term corresponds to $J_L J_R$ and is more complicated. It can be thought of as a noise between incoming and outgoing channels. J_R acting on the new ground state can create pairs particle-hole of solitons, create pairs solitons antisolitons, or add breathers. Only the rst process contributes to low energy. The particle-hole pairs then \bounce" on the boundary where they can switch charges. They are then acted on by J_L and \destroyed". Observe how ever that in this destruction, an initial soliton can be replaced by an antisoliton since now the ground state is a mixture.

The dressing follows a similar principle. If we write:

$$P(_{1})P(_{1}) + Q(_{1})Q(_{1}) [1 + i(_{1})(_{1} _{1})];$$

(where is real as can easily be proven using that $\mathcal{P} \stackrel{?}{j} + \mathcal{D} \stackrel{?}{j} = 1$) we can dress the rejection matrices according to :

From [1], we nd that the low frequency noise is now written :

$$S_{LR} (!) (x_{1}; x_{2}) = dte^{i!t} hJ_{L} (t; x_{1})J_{R} (0; x_{2})i$$

$$= \frac{g}{2} \int_{1}^{1} d_{2} d_{2} P (2)P (2) Q (2)Q (2)Q (2)e^{2}e^{2}$$
(6.5)
$$! e^{2} e^{2} e^{i!(x_{1} - x_{2})}:$$

here x_1 and x_2 physically correspond to the two sides of the impurity, and should be taken di erent in general. For the tunneling noise, both x_1 and x_2 will approach 0 and the phase will disappear. By the same manipulations as above this can be rewritten :

$$S_{LR} (!) (x_1; x_2) = \frac{g}{2} e^{i! (x_1 - x_2)} \int_{0}^{Z_1} P(x) P(x - !) Q(x) Q(x - !) dx:$$
(6:6)

Of particular interest is the limiting behaviour of S as ! ! 0. In that limit, we pick up the value of the argument in the integral (6.6) for x = 0 for which the dressing e ect just

cancels out. One nds simply :

$$S_{LR} (!) \frac{gj! j}{2} \mathcal{P} (A) \mathcal{f} \mathcal{j} (A) \mathcal{f} e^{i! (x_1 - x_2)}$$

$$= \frac{gj! j}{2} (2\mathcal{P} (A) \mathcal{f} - 1) e^{i! (x_1 - x_2)}$$

$$= \frac{gj! j}{2} (2\mathcal{P} (A) \mathcal{f} - 1) e^{i! (x_1 - x_2)}$$

$$= \frac{gj! j}{2} (2\mathcal{P} (A) \mathcal{f} - 1) e^{i! (x_1 - x_2)}$$

$$= \frac{gj! j}{2} (2\mathcal{P} (A) \mathcal{f} - 1) e^{i! (x_1 - x_2)}$$

$$= \frac{gj! j}{2} (2\mathcal{P} (A) \mathcal{f} - 1) e^{i! (x_1 - x_2)}$$

$$= \frac{gj! j}{2} (2\mathcal{P} (A) \mathcal{f} - 1) e^{i! (x_1 - x_2)}$$

$$= \frac{gj! j}{2} (2\mathcal{P} (A) \mathcal{f} - 1) e^{i! (x_1 - x_2)}$$

$$= \frac{gj! j}{2} (2\mathcal{P} (A) \mathcal{f} - 1) e^{i! (x_1 - x_2)}$$

$$= \frac{gj! j}{2} (2\mathcal{P} (A) \mathcal{f} - 1) e^{i! (x_1 - x_2)}$$

$$= \frac{gj! j}{2} (2\mathcal{P} (A) \mathcal{f} - 1) e^{i! (x_1 - x_2)}$$

$$= \frac{gj! j}{2} (2\mathcal{P} (A) \mathcal{f} - 1) e^{i! (x_1 - x_2)}$$

$$= \frac{gj! j}{2} (2\mathcal{P} (A) \mathcal{f} - 1) e^{i! (x_1 - x_2)}$$

$$= \frac{gj! j}{2} (2\mathcal{P} (A) \mathcal{f} - 1) e^{i! (x_1 - x_2)}$$

$$= \frac{gj! j}{2} (2\mathcal{P} (A) \mathcal{f} - 1) e^{i! (x_1 - x_2)}$$

At large voltage it goes to the noise without impurity as expected. At sm all voltage we nd: #

$$S_{LR} (!) = e^{i! (x_1 - x_2)} \frac{gj! j}{2G_+ (i)} \frac{G_+ (0)}{2G_+ (i)} \frac{2(\frac{1}{g} - 1)}{T_B} \frac{V}{T_B} \frac{2(\frac{1}{g} - 1)}{2} \frac{gj! j}{2} : (6:8)$$

The last term corresponds to $J_L J_L$ and can be interpreted as a noise purely in the outgoing channel. It does have quite a bit of structure. At leading order at low frequencies, the rst process that contributes is the creation of a particle hole pair near the Ferm i surface. Observe how ever that due to the mixing induced by the boundary, one can either destroy a soliton and create another one above the sea, or destroy an antisoliton and create another one above the sea 11 . At leading order, one nds, at coincident points :

$$S_{LL}(!) = \frac{gj! j}{2} p(A)f j (A)f^{2} = \frac{gj! j}{2} 1 - \frac{4}{7} p(A)f (A)f : (6:9)$$

Observe that S_{RR} ; S_{LR} and S_{LL} are respectively of order 0;2 and 4 in the R-matrix elements. Adding all the components we not the low frequency noise of the tunneling current: 0 1 c

$$S_{t}(!) \quad \frac{gj! j}{2} j_{2}(A)_{j}^{4} = \frac{gj! j}{2} e_{\frac{2^{(\frac{1}{g}-1)A}}{e^{2(\frac{1}{g}-1)A} + T_{B}^{2(\frac{1}{g}-1)}}} A_{j}(!) ! 0:$$
(6:10)

This noise reproduces the standard result $S_t = \frac{gj! j}{2}$ at small voltage, where there is no transmitted current. This noise vanishes at very large voltage, when the tunneling current goes to zero, as :

$$S_{t}(!) = \frac{g}{2} j! j \frac{2G_{+}(i)}{G_{+}(0)} = \frac{4(\frac{1}{g}-1)}{V} = \frac{T_{B}}{V} = \frac{4(\frac{1}{g}-1)}{j!} j! l 0:$$
(6:11)

¹¹ Due to this mixing also, it is also possible to destroy a pair of particles close to the Ferm i surface. This process how ever does not contribute at leading order because the form factors for destroying a pair + and a pair + are opposite.

The noise for the current running down the sample can also be expressed simply as :

$$S_{T}(!) = \frac{gj! j}{2} \mathcal{P}(A) j^{4}$$
: (6:12)

Let us stress here that a priori, all these results hold only for 0 < g < 1. As g ! 1, the threshold for adding an antisoliton vanishes M in () = $(1 \ g)V ! 0$, so exactly at g = 1 other processes are implied in the low frequency physics. In other words, we expect a priori that

Interestingly however, exactly for g = 1 the noise is easy to compute directly [29] since the electrons are non interacting, and one nds the same as (6.11). In that light, (6.10) actually appears very natural since we showed that the low energy excitations at V \neq 0 are described by an elective free ferm ion theory.

Sim ilarly, as g ! 0, the threshold for adding breathers vanishes, and non commutativity of the lim its is also a priori expected.

6.2. Other singularities?

The e ect of thresholds we have discussed for the double well problem should be observable as well in the noise, both for S_{LR} and S_{LL} , leading to a rst singularity of the form j! gV j and presum ably other singularities of the same form m j! ngV j. As an example, let us discuss the singularity at ! = gV. Like in the double well problem, it arises because the two processes of creation of a pair particle-hole and of a breather do not m atch at $! = !_c$. For the particle-hole process, the bulk am plitude gets multiplied by a factor $\mathcal{D}(A)f$. This is because, for a hole at $_1$ and a particle at $_2$, the general am plitude is :

$$P(_2)P(_1) Q(_2)Q(_1)j^2;$$

and at leading order close to the threshold, we have $_2 = 1$ and $_1 = A$. For the breather process, the bulk amplitude is unchanged since at leading order, the breather re ection m atrix appears only in the form of its modulus square. Hence the singularity is proportional to

In addition, other singularities take place in S_{LR} . This is because, beside the processes of the double well problem, other processes are allowed here, for instance the destruction

of a pair of particles close to the Ferm i surface, as already mentioned earlier. Now this process can take place provided the frequency ! is smaller than twice the maximum energy of a hole in the sea, or ! < 2gV. Hence, this process contributes a singularity which is how ever weaker than j! 2gV j. More generally, processes where 2p particles are destroyed in the sea have a maximum frequency ! = 2pgV, and should lead to singularities weaker than j! 2pgV j. Recall that such processes are allowed in the general interacting theory, in contrast with the case g = 1=2 where only pairs can be created by the current, which implies that the excess noise in the outgoing channel vanishes for ! > 2gV.

6.3. Comparison with perturbative results

Finally, we would like to compare our results with the perturbative approach of [10], [11] concerning the noise in the tunneling problem. For the low frequency behaviour, we agree that there is a singularity of the type j! j but the amplitude (6.11) that we nd does not agree with these authors, except for g = 1=2 and g = 1. Observe that the amplitude we nd for the j! j singularity, while expanding nicely at large in powers of 4=g, does not expand in powers of 4 at small . This suggests that the UV perturbation theory attempted in [10],[11] has a vanishing radius of convergence. In particular, we nd that the large voltage behaviour of the amplitude goes as $V^{4-4=g}$, instead of $V^{4(g-1)}$.

In fact, we can discuss the di erence in more details. Indeed, Chamon, Freed and W en have recently [30] obtained for the noise the expression 12

$$S_{T}(!) = \frac{!}{2g} \left(\frac{dI}{dV} \right)^{2};$$
 (6:15)

instead of our expression (6.12). It is worthwhile to exam ine the di erence in m ore details. In [7] the DC current in the presence of a voltage was determ ined,

$$I = 2 + () P ()^{2};$$
 (6:16)

To obtain the dimensial conductance, we take derivative with respect to V. The derivative of the density can be obtained from (2.7):

$$2 \frac{d_{+}()}{dV} = \frac{r_{-}}{2}L(;A); \qquad (6.17)$$

¹² Unfortunately, what is called L and R here is a bit di erent from the notations adopted in [11],[30]. The di erent noises are how ever simply related by linear combinations.

from which it follows that

$$G = \frac{dI}{dV} = \frac{r}{2} \frac{g}{2} p(A)f + L(;A)p()^{2}d :$$
(6:18)

De ne a new renorm alized re ection m atrix

$$\mathcal{P}_{diff}()^{2} = \mathcal{P}()^{2}_{j} \qquad ()^{0} \mathcal{P}_{diff}()^{0}_{j}^{2} d^{0}; \qquad (6:19)$$

then (6.18) reads

$$G = \frac{1}{2} \frac{g}{2} \mathcal{P}_{diff} (A) \mathcal{J}:$$
 (6.20)

The meaning of this result is as follows. Starting with a voltage V, one is interested in the additional current when V ! V + V. This current has two origins: one is the shift of the Ferm i sea, the other one is the change in populations deep in the Ferm i sea. The shift of the Ferm i sea adds a number of solitons

$$N = L_{+} (A) A = \frac{L}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{q}{2} V:$$
 (6.21)

If we want to write the change of current in terms of those particles only, it has to involve a dressed relection matrix which takes into account all what happens deep in the Ferm i sea:

$$\frac{I}{V} = 2 \frac{N}{L} \mathcal{P}_{diff} (A) \mathcal{J}; \qquad (6:22)$$

which coincides with (6.18) using (6.19). Hence the dimensional conductance can be fully interpreted in terms of a new dressed rejection matrix.

In this language, the form ula (6.15) reads

$$S_{T}(!) = \frac{g!}{2} \mathcal{P}_{diff}(A)^{4}$$
: (6:23)

The di erence with our form ula (6.12) is thus fully a di erence in the dressed re ection m atrix. N aively, based on current computations, one would have expected (eg by analogy with dissipative quantum m echanics) that (6.23) would hold. The key point how ever is that the dressing of re ection m atrices is not a universal property, but depends on the quantity under study. For the conductance, the whole of the Ferm i sea m atters, and the renorm alized re ection m atrix P_{diff} involves the whole sea as well. For the (T = 0) noise, the only e ect of the sea in P is a phase that disappears in m oduli square. P resum ably, this is a non perturbative e ect that cannot be seen in the approach of [30].

Sim ilarly, we disagree on the singularity structure. Except for g = 1=2 we nd that the noise $S_t(!)$ has a singularity at ! = gV - the \quasi particle singularity "-where the rst derivative is discontinuous, while the authors of [10], [11] argued that this singularity was either a g-dependent power law, or was absent.

7. Conclusions.

This paper is a rst step towards the computation of correlation functions in quantum in purity problems in the presence of a voltage and a temperature. While much remains to be done, we think the present results already indicate very interesting features, and could lead to numerical and experimental applications. In particular, the presence of a singularity at ! = gV at T = 0, while probably unobservable experimentally, should lead to a pic in the derivative $\frac{dS(!)}{d!}$ at nite T. We also expect that such pics should appear in fact at regularly spaced values ! = ngV at nite T (while presumably the amplitudes of these pics will decrease very rapidely with n). The meaning of the singularities at T = 0 can be understood in the double well problem : $\binom{00}{(!)}$ going as j! gV = j! j simply means that the long time behaviour of the spin spin correlator has an oscillatory component $\frac{e^{it}}{t^2}$.

A more complete discussion of the low energy excitations, including further justications of (3.6), will be provided in the following paper [22], together with some results at V = 0 but T > 0.

A cknow ledgem ents

We thank C. de C. Cham on, S. Chakravarty, T A. Costi, D. Freed and A. Rosch for very useful discussions, and for kindly communicating their results prior publication. We especially thank C. de C. Cham on for patiently explaining to us the papers [10],[11],[30], and T.A. Costi and A. Rosch for checking some of our form ulas at high eld using their NRG method.

This work was supported by the Packard Foundation, the National Young Investigator program (NSF-PHY-9357207) and the DOE (DE-FG03-84ER40168). F. Lesage is also partly supported by a canadian NSERC Postdoctoral Fellow ship.

Appendix A. The e ects of the magnetic eld and voltage

Introduce :

$$L_{G} = \frac{1}{16 \text{ g}} \int_{1}^{Z_{0}} dx \quad (\theta_{t})^{2} \quad (\theta_{x})^{2} : \qquad (A.1)$$

Let us then de ne

$$L(h^{0}) = L_{G} - \frac{h^{0}}{4} \int_{1}^{2} \theta_{t} :$$
 (A.2)

Introducing

$$H_{G} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 8 & g \end{bmatrix}^{2} + \frac{1}{8 & g} (\theta_{x})^{2} ; \qquad (A.3)$$

the associated ham iltonian is

H (h⁰) = H_G + L
$$\frac{g}{4}$$
 (h⁰)² + 2gh⁰ (x)dx: (A.4)

M ore generally, we can also put a boundary coupling and a boundary eld, de ning

$$H_{B} = S_{+} e^{i (0)=2} + S e^{i (0)=2}$$
; (A.5)

and

$$H(h;h^{0}) = H_{G} + H_{B} + L\frac{g}{4}(h^{0})^{2} + 2gh^{0} \qquad (x)dx + \frac{h}{2}S_{z}; \qquad (A.6)$$

The unconventional norm alisation is taken to agree with the presentation in the bulk of the text. The total z-component of the spin, which commutes with the ham iltonian, reads with these norm alizations Z_0

$$S_{total} = \frac{1}{2 g} \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} (\theta_t + S_z)$$
 (A.7)

Hence, when $h^0 = \frac{h}{g}$, (A.6) describes the eld $\frac{h}{2}$ coupled to the total spin. O therw ise, a di erent eld is coupled to the boundary and bulk components of this spin. Now, the term linear in (A.6) can be eliminated by a unitary transform ation. Introduce

$$U = \exp \frac{ih^0}{4} \int_{1}^{2} (x) dx$$
; (A.8)

then one nds

UH
$$(h;h^{0})U^{1} = H (h;h^{0} = 0) L \frac{g}{4} (h^{0})^{2}$$
: (A.9)

As a result, the therm odynam ic properties of the in purity are the same whether there is a eld coupled to the in purity spin S_z only, or a eld coupled to the in purity and another eld coupled to the the component $\begin{bmatrix} R_0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$ e_t , including the particular case of a eld coupled to the total spin. This is similar to the observations in [31]. To be more precise, introduce

$$Z_{1}(h;h^{0}) = Tre^{(h;h^{0})};$$
 (A.10)

with the trace taken in the spin 1=2 representation (where by convention recall we chose $S_z = -1$). Then one has

$$Z_{1}(h) = \frac{Z_{1}(h;h^{0};)}{Z_{1}(h=0;h^{0}; = 0)} = \frac{Z_{1}(h;h^{0}=0;)}{Z_{1}(h=0;h^{0}=0; = 0)}:$$
 (A.11)

In [25], we checked this relation in the particular case $h^0 = \frac{h}{g}$ in the rst numerator, since we found in [25] that the coe cients of the perturbative expansion in of the second ratio in (A.11) coincide exactly with the results of TBA calculations for the K ondo m odel coupled to the total spin, is the rst ratio in (A.11).

In (A.7), the g factor is a standard renorm alization that can be observed for instance in the continuum limit of the XXZ chain regularization [21] of the K ondo m odel [32]. For convenience, we de ne the spin of a soliton or antisoliton to be $\frac{1}{q}$ in what follows.

The scattering theory description of the spin 1=2 K ondo model involves only the soliton and antisoliton because it is an IR description, and in the IR the boundary spin is screened. Conservation of the spin then simply translates into the fact that solitons bounce back into antisolitons.

A coupling $\frac{h}{2}S_z$ to the boundary spin can also be traded for a time dependent boundary coupling. Indeed, consider for instance the computation of Z₁ perturbatively in . At order 2n, one has C oulom b gas integrals related with a 2D C oulom b gas on a circle with n positive and n negative charges alternating. Call = it the imaginary time, and suppose an S₄ term has been inserted at and an S term at ⁰ > . The e ect of the term $\frac{h}{2}S_z$ in the ham iltonian (A.6) is to give a weight exp (⁰) h to the pair of insertions of S₄; S, relative to the weight with no insertion. Now from (A.1) we see that every insertion of S is coupled with an insertion of exp i (0)=2. The e ect of the $\frac{h}{2}S_z$ term can thus be absorbed into a time-dependent phase multiplying the vertex operators in H_B,

In addition, the term $\frac{h}{2}S_z$ gives rise to an overall term exp h=2, independent of the order n, that can be absorbed by taking a modi ed trace $Tr(:) ! Tr(:) e^{\frac{h}{2}S_z}$.

The foregoing chain of arguments generalizes to higher spins in SU $(2)_q$. This is obvious for the h^0 term which is independent of the spin. As for the h term, it follows simply from the fact that insertions of S change the spin S_z by 1, independently of the representation.

The properties of correlators with (A.6) can be analyzed by the sam e sort of argum ents, and the various transform ations easily followed on each term of the correlators.

The rst relevant point for this paper is that, although the dissipative quantum mechanics (anisotropic K ondo) ham iltonian has a eld coupled only to the boundary spin h = gV, it can be transformed, up to a shift of the ground state energy, into a ham iltonian where the eld is coupled to the total spin $h^0 = \frac{1}{\sigma} = V$; h = gV, and then easily diagonalized by Bethe-ansatz. In the massless description we are using, the boundary spin is screened, and only solitons and antisolitons have to be considered, with an energy shift equal to V=2==2g. Since we are using a scattering approach, the eigenstates are built as explained at the beginning of section 4 by combining the left and right (asymptotic) eigenstates of the full line ham iltonian (2.1). The presence of the impurity does actually change the densities by a factor of order 1=L, which does not a ect the results we are interested in.

The second point concerns the inpurity in a Luttinger liquid. Recall, following [25], that the boundary sine-G ordon model is in fact equivalent to an anisotropic K ondo model where the boundary spin is dened in a special, cyclic representation of SU (2)_q (or, alternatively, in a representation of the q-oscillator algebra [33]). While these boundary spins can be \gauged away", let us discuss them a bit more. First, asymptotic states are now characterized by particles and by the value of the renormalized boundary spin. Indeed, let us stress here that the boundary spins that appear in the ham iltonian s_H and in the scattering theory s_{scat} di er for two reasons. There is the screening, already mentioned previously for the K ondo problem, and the multiplicative renormalization, which can be observed by considering the energies with a magnetic eld. One nds s_{scat} = $\frac{1}{g}$ (s_H 1), where the g factor was also mentioned previously.

The main use of the boundary spins is to reinstall conservation of the spin. This is obvious on the ham iltonian which looks then like a higher spin K ondo problem. This is also obvious in the scattering theory : every time a soliton bounces back as a soliton instead of an antisoliton, the boundary spin increases its value accordingly. The conservation of the spin allows diagonalization of the problem with a voltage. In particular since a pair R-soliton, $S_z = \frac{m}{g}$ and L-soliton, $S_z = \frac{m+1}{g}$ have the same charge and the same kinetic energy, they should have the same energy, ie $\frac{V}{2} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{V}{2}$, where we used h = gV, an identity which we mentioned previously. Also, in section 4, while the state (6.1) seem ed to be m ade of particles rejected with di erent energies, it is more precisely a combination of true asymptotic states that involve also the boundary spin, that all have the same e total spin, and all the same energy. Therefore, for the in purity problem, one starts with a time edependent term in the boundary spin. An additional term coupled to the component $\binom{R_0}{1}$ (θ_t is then added, and allows for the use of the Bethe ansatz with a eld coupled to the total spin. The boundary spin is nally gauged away.

The argum ents of this appendix provide the m issing steps in the proof of the DC noise form ula (27) of [9]. They also justify why in [25] the Bethe ansatz for a eld coupled to the total spin was used, although the initial ham iltonian had a eld coupled to the boundary spin only.

Finally, let us stress that, while the double well is a problem in equilibrium, the tunneling problem is not. As simple way to see that is to observe that, while we used an eigenstate of the boundary ham iltonian with the R part m ade only of solitons, there are, thanks to the boundary spin which can absorb all spin (charge) shifts, an in nity of other boundary states, and averaging over all of them would, for instance, lead to a vanishing DC current as expected in equilibrium. Our approach here is fact fully equivalent to the Landauer-Buttiker scattering. In that context, it is also interesting to mention that the transform ations previously discussed change the boundary conditions at in nity, which can be interpreted in terms of reservoirs. The latter are implicitly there in the scattering approach [11].

References

- F.Lesage, H.Saleur, S.Skorik, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76 (1996) 3388, cond-m at/9512087; Nucl. Phys. B 474 (1996) 602, cond-m at/9603043.
- [2] F A.Sm imov, \Form factors in completely integrable models of quantum eld theory", W orlk Scientic, and references therein.
- [3] G.Del no, G.Mussardo, P.Sim onetti, Phys. Rev. D 51, 6620 (1995).
- [4] A J.Leggett, S.Chakravarty, A.T.Dorsey, M.P.A.Fisher, A.Garg, W. Zwerger, Rev. M od. Phys., 59, 1 (1987).
- [5] F.Guinea, V.Hakim, A.Muramatsu, Phys. Rev. B 32, 4410 (1985); S.A.Bulgadaev, JEPT vol. 38, 264 (1984), Sov. Phys. JETP, vol. 39, 314 (1984).
- [6] K.Moon, H.Yi, C.L.Kane, S.M.Girvin, M.P.A.Fisher, Phys. Rev. Lett. 71, No26, 4381.
- [7] P.Fendley, A W W .Ludwig, H.Saleur, Phys. Rev. B 52, 8934 (1995), cond-m at/9503172.
- [8] P. Fendley, A W W. Ludwig, H. Saleur, Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 2196 (1995), condm at/9505031
- [9] P.Fendley, H. Saleur, to appear in Phys. Rev. B., cond-m at/9601117.
- [10] C.deC.Chamon, D.Freed, and X.G.Wen, Phys. Rev. B 51 (1995) 2363.
- [11] C.deC.Chamon, D.Freed, and X.G.Wen, Phys. Rev. B53 (1996) 4033.
- [12] V E.Korepin, N M. Bogoliubov, A.G. Izergin, \Quantum inverse scattering method and correlation functions", Cambridge University Press, (1993).
- [13] C.L.Kane, M.P.A.Fisher, Phys. Rev. B 46, N 023, 15233.
- [14] S.Ghoshal, A.Zam olodchikov, Int.J.M od.Phys.A9, 3841 (1994).
- [15] H.Shiba, Prog. Theor. Phys. 54, (1975) 967.
- [16] M.Sassetti, U.Weiss, Phys. Rev. Lett. 65, 2262 (1990).
- [17] T.A.Costi, C.Kie er, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 1683 (1996).
- [18] T.A.Costi, Private Communication.
- [19] S.Chakravarty, J.Rudnick, Phys. Rev. Lett. 75 501 (1995).
- [20] F.Guinea, Phys. Rev. B, vol. 32, 4486 (1985).
- [21] A.N.Kirillov, N.Yu Reshetikhin, J.Phys. A 20 (1987) 1587.
- [22] F. Lesage, H. Saleur, in preparation.
- [23] M. Sassetti, U. Weiss, Phys. Rev. A 41 (1990) 5383.
- [24] P.Fendley, H.Saleur, N.P.W amer, Nucl. Phys. B 340 (1994) 577.
- [25] P.Fendley, F.Lesage, H.Saleur, J.Stat. Phys. (1996) to appear, cond-m at/9510055.
- [26] V.V.Bazhanov, S.L.Lukyanov, A.B.Zam olodchikov, Comm. M ath. Phys. 177 (1996) 381, hep-th/9412229.
- [27] P.Fendley, H.Saleur, N.Warner, Nucl. Phys. B430 (1994) 577.
- [28] R.Landauer, Phys. Rev. B 47 (1993) 16427; M.Buttiker, Phys. Rev. B 46 (1992) 12485.
- [29] S.R.E.Yang.Solid State Comm. 81 (1992) 375.

- [30] C.deC.Chamon,D.Freed, and X.G.W en, to appear
- [31] J.H.Lowenstein, Phys. Rev. B 29 (1984) 4120.
- [32] H. Saleur, unpublished.
- [33] V.V.Bazhanov, S.L.Lukyanov, A.B.Zam olodchikov, hep-th/9604044.