# Sem iclassical Approach to Orbital Magnetism of Interacting Diusive Quantum Systems

D.Ullm  $o_{\mathbf{r}}^{(1;2)}$  K.Richter,  $^{(3)}$  H.J.Baranger,  $^{(1)}$  F.von Oppen,  $^{(4)}$  and R.A.Jalabert  $^{(5)}$ 

(2) D ivision de Physique Theorique, Institut de Physique Nucleaire, 91406 O rsay Cedex, France
(3) M ax-P lanck-Institut fur Physik kom plexer System e, Nothnitzer Str. 38, 01187 D resden G erm any
(4) D epartm ent of Condensed M atter Physics, W eizm ann Institute, 76100 Rehovot, Israel
(5) Universite Louis Pasteur, IPCM S-GEMME, 23 rue du Loess, 67037 Strasbourg Cedex, France

## A bstract

We study interaction elects on the orbital magnetism of diffusive mesoscopic quantum systems. By combining many-body perturbation theory with semiclassical techniques, we show that the interaction contribution to the ensemble averaged quantum thermodynamic potential can be reduced to an essentially classical operator. We compute the magnetic response of disordered rings and dots for diffusive classical dynamics. Our semiclassical approach reproduces the results of previous diagram matic quantum calculations.

#### A . Introduction

The interplay of disorder and interactions in m esoscopic systems has attracted considerable attention [1]. Interaction e ects on transport through small quantum dots [2] as well as on them odynamic properties like persistent currents and orbital magnetism are of present interest. In the latter case, the unexpectedly large measured persistent current of small metalrings [3{5}] pointed towards the importance of such interaction e ects and motivated a large number of theoretical approaches [6].

For the description of therm odynam ic quantities, sem iclassical expansions have proven particularly useful, both within the independent-particle model [7{9] and for interaction e ects [10,11]. These studies established a close relation between the classical dynam ics and the quantum -mechanical magnetic response. In particular, studies of ballistic systems showed that the quantum thermodynam ic properties are sensitive to whether the classical dynam ics is regular or chaotic [8,9,11].

In this paper we apply these sem iclassical techniques to the orbital magnetism of interacting systems whose non {interacting classical dynamics is discussed. Specifically, we present

sem iclassical derivations of the interaction contributions to the persistent current of metal rings and to the susceptibility of singly {connected two {dimensional di usive systems. We recover results obtained previously by quantum diagram matic calculations [12{17], showing that the sem iclassical approach is on the same level of approximation. By sem iclassically evaluating the relevant diagrams appearing in the many-body perturbation series for the thermodynamic potential, we express the latter in terms of an essentially classical operator. This expression provides a convenient starting point for further calculations. Moreover, by making the connection with the classical dynamics, it provides a physically intuitive picture of the interplay between disorder and interaction.

### B.D iagram m atic perturbation theory

We are interested in the orbital magnetism of a mesoscopic quantum system subject to an external magnetic eld B. While the magnetic response of a singly {connected system is usually measured in terms of its susceptibility, the magnetic moment of a ring {type structure threaded by a ux = BA (where A is the enclosed area) is usually described by the related persistent current I. Both are given in terms of the thermodynamic potential as (V being the area (volume)

$$I \qquad \stackrel{\text{@}}{\stackrel{\text{@}}}{\stackrel{\text{@}}{\stackrel{\text{@}}}}{\stackrel{\text{@}}{\stackrel{\text{@}}}}{\stackrel{\text{@}}{\stackrel{\text{@}}}}{\stackrel{\text{@}}{\stackrel{\text{@}}}}{\stackrel{\text{@}}}}}}}}.$$
 (1)

To calculate the interaction contribution to the magnetic response, the high-density expansion (RPA) of the therm odynam ic potential [18] has to be extended by including interaction corrections from diagram swith the Cooper-channel. This was originally performed in the context of superconducting uctuations and then applied to disordered normal metals [12{17}]. Such expansions usually yield reliable results even beyond the high density limit, if the relevant sets of terms are properly resummed. The relevant Cooper-like diagrams are shown in Fig. 1. The screened Coulomb interaction (wavy lines) can be treated as local [14,15]: U (r  $^{\circ}$ ) =  $^{\circ}$ N (0)  $^{\circ}$ 1 (r  $^{\circ}$ ). Here, N (0) denotes the density of states and the bookkeeping index  $^{\circ}$ 0 = 1 identies the order of perturbation. For the local interaction, direct and exchange term are equivalent up to a factor of (2) due to the spin sums and the dierent number of fermion loops. The corresponding perturbation expansion for this interaction contribution to the therm odynam ic potential, which yields the magnetic response, can be formally expressed as [13,14]

FIG.1. Leading Cooper-channel diagram s for the interaction contribution to the thermodynam ic potential.

$$= \frac{1}{n} \frac{x^{\frac{1}{2}}}{n} \frac{(0)^{n}}{n} \times \frac{x^{\frac{2}{2}}}{n!} dr_{1} ::: dr_{n} r_{1} r_{2} (!) ::: r_{n} r_{1} (!)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \times \frac{x^{\frac{1}{2}}}{n!} r_{1} r_{1} r_{2} r_{1} r_{2} r_{2$$

Here,! denotes the bosonic M atsubara frequencies! =  $2\pi$  = with = 1=kT. The particle-particle propagator  $\hat{}$ (!) is expressed (in position representation) in terms of products of nite {tem perature G reen functions as [18]

$$_{r,r^{0}}(!) = \frac{1}{N(0)} \stackrel{\bar{X}^{F}}{\longrightarrow} G_{r,r^{0}}()G_{r,r^{0}}(!)$$
 : (3)

Here, the sum runs over the ferm ionic M atsubara frequencies = (2n+1) = . The short-length (high-frequency) behavior is included in the screened interaction, thus requiring a cuto of the frequency sums at the Ferm i energy  $E_{\rm F}$  [14]. The straight lines in Fig. 1 represent nite(temperature Green functions of the non(interacting system. They are of the form

$$G_{r,r^0}() = ()_{G_{r,r^0}}^{R}(E_F + i) + ()_{G_{r,r^0}}^{R}(E_F + i)$$
 (4)

in term s of the retarded and advanced G reen functions  $G^{R;A}$  which are related by  $G^{A}_{r,r^0}(E) = [G^{R}_{r^0,r}(E)]$ . For discovery system s, they include the presence of the disorder potential.

#### C . Sem iclassical form alism

Both in ballistic and di usive samples, the Fermiwavelength  $_{\rm F}$  is often the shortest lengthscale. It is in this situation that we can apply semiclassical techniques to compute  $_{\rm r,r^0}(!)$ . Here, we will moreover assume that the magnetic eld B is classically weak, i.e., that the cyclotron radius R  $_{\rm c}$  minfl;Lg (with 1 the elastic mean free path and L the system size).

Sem iclassically, the retarded G reen function is represented as a sum of contributions  $G_{r,r^0}^{R;j}$  over all classical paths j from r to  $r^0$  [19],

$$G_{r,r^{0}}^{R}(E)$$
 '  $\sum_{j:r!}^{X} D_{j} e^{iS_{j}=h \ i \ j=2}$ : (5)

Here  $S_j = {R_r^0 \over r}p$  dr is the classical action of trajectory j. The prefactor p includes the classical phase space density  $p_j = (1 = 2 \text{ (ih)}^3 \underline{x}\underline{x}^0) \ p^2 S_j = eyey^0 p^0 p^{-1}$  in two dimensions].  $p_j$  is a M aslov index. The sem iclassical approximation makes the temperature and magneticely elemented dependences of the nite (temperature G reen function transparent. Employing (escaped be and (escaped be) = (e=c)A\_j, where  $p_j$  and  $p_j$  are the traversal time and area, one note that  $p_j$  are the traversal time and area, one note that  $p_j$  is a specific production transparent.

$$G_{r,r^{0}}^{R;j}(E_{F}+i;B)'G_{r,r^{0}}^{R;j}(E_{F};B=0) = \exp[i2 BA_{j}=0]$$
 (6)

where  $_0$  = hc=e is the ux quantum . Note that temperature exponentially suppresses the contributions of long paths to each G reen function.

Sem iclassically, the particle-particle propagator  $_{r,r^0}(!)$  is then represented as a sum over pairs of paths between r and  $r^0$ . O {diagonal pairs (of dierent paths) generally contain highly oscillatory contributions which do not survive an ensemble (disorder) average. (There can be exceptions as discussed in Ref. [11].) On the other hand, the diagonal pairing of each orbit j with its time reverse persists upon averaging since their dynamical phases  $\exp[iS_j(B=0)=h]$  cancel while retaining a magnetic-eld dependence. A more detailed sem iclassical analysis [11] shows that the Cooper series in Fig. 1 contains the magnetic-eld sensitive contribution to which is leading order in h.

U sing Eqs. (4), (5) and (6) in Eq. (3) and perform ing the M atsubara sum yields for the diagonal part of  $\hat{}$ 

$$\frac{(D)}{r_{j}r^{0}}(!) ' \frac{h}{N(0)} \int_{j_{T}}^{L} x^{2} \int_{j_{T}}^{0} \int_{j_{T}}^{1} \frac{R(2t_{j}=t_{T})}{t_{j}} \exp \frac{i4 B A_{j}}{0}^{\#} \exp \frac{!t_{j}}{h} :$$
 (7)

$$t_{T} = \frac{h}{}$$
 (8)

and the related length scale  $L_T = v_F \, t_T$ , with  $v_F$  being the Ferm i velocity. This sem iclassical fram ework allows us to reduce the original quantum problem to  $^{(D)}$  which no longer exhibits variations on the quantum scale  $_F$  but only on classical scales. We emphasize that the representation (7) of  $^{(D)}$  is rather general since we have not yet made any assumption about the classical dynamics of the system. In particular, it applies to both disciplent and ballistic systems. On the basis of Eq. (7), we have recently studied interaction exciplent in ballistic quantum dots [11]. Specifically, we show that the interaction induced orbital magnetism scales discreptly for systems with regular and chaotic non interacting classical counterparts.

Here, we focus on di usive systems for which it is useful to relate  $^{\mathbb{D}}$ ) to classical probabilities satisfying the di usion equation. To this end we introduce an additional time integration in Eq. (7) and make use of the relation [7]

$$\frac{1}{2^{2}} \sum_{j=1}^{X} p_{j} \hat{f} (t + t) = \frac{N(0)}{2 h} P(r; r^{0}; t)$$
 (9)

between the weights  $\mathfrak{P}_{j}$  and the classical probability P (r; r°; t) to propagate from r to r° in time t.

An n-th order contribution to in Eq. (2) then contains expressions for the joint return probability P  $(r_1; \ldots; r_n; r_1; t_1; \ldots; t_n; A)$  to visit the points  $r_i$  (with  $t_i$  being the time between  $r_i$  and  $r_{i+1}$ ) under the condition that the enclosed area is A. In discussive systems, the probability is multiplicative, namely  $dr_1 \ldots dr_n P(r_1; \ldots; r_n; r_1; t_1; \ldots; t_n; A) = drP(r_i; r_i; t_{tot}; A)$  with  $t_{tot} = t_i$ . The contribution to in Eq. (2) from the diagonal terms  $p_i$  then yields

$$\mathbb{O} = \frac{X}{n} = \frac{1}{n} = \frac{1}{n}$$

where the coth ( $t=t_T$ ) arises from the ! (sum in Eq. (2) and

$$K (t) = X K_{n}(t) = X \frac{(0)^{n}}{n} \frac{(X_{n}^{t})^{n}}{n} \frac{dt_{i}R (2t_{i}=t_{n}^{t})^{*}}{t_{i}} (t_{n}^{t})$$

$$A (r;t;B) dA cos \frac{4 B A}{n} P (r;r;t;A) :$$
(11)

A (r;t;B) 
$$\stackrel{\sim}{d}$$
 dA  $\cos \frac{4 \text{ BA}}{\Omega}$  P (r;r;t;Ā): (12)

K (t) accounts for tem perature e ects while A contains the eld dependence and the classical return probability. Eqs. (10) { (12) are a general and convenient starting point to compute the orbital response of disordered system s.

#### D.Di usive rings

We start with the computation of the rst-order interaction contribution,  $\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$ , to illustrate the main ideas. Consider a (thin) disordered ring of width b, crossection circum ference L. For L l;b the motion of particles around the ring e ectively follows a law for one {dim ensional di usion. Since the area enclosed is given in term s of the number m of windings around the ring, one has

$$P(r;r;t;A) = \frac{x^{1}}{4} \frac{1}{Dt} \exp \frac{m^{2}L^{2}!}{4Dt} A \frac{mL^{2}!}{4}; \qquad (13)$$

where  $D = v_F$  led is the discrete constant (in d dimensions). Because of the discrete average the classical return probability does not depend on r. In rst order we have

$$K_1(t) = {}_{0}R(2t = t_{T}) = t:$$
 (14)

Combining this with the coth function in Eq. (10) we nd

$$\int_{1}^{(D)} = \int_{0}^{Lh} \frac{X^{1}}{m = 1} \cos \frac{4 m}{0} g_{m} (T)$$
 (15)

with

$$g_{m} (T) = \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} dt \frac{R^{2} (t=t_{T})}{t^{2}} \frac{\exp \left[ (m L)^{2} = (4D t) \right]}{\frac{P}{4 D t}}$$
(16)

Taking the derivative with respect to the ux, we recover the rst-order interaction contribution to the persistent current, rst obtained in [15] by purely diagram matic techniques,

$$I_1 = {}_0 \frac{2Le}{{}_{m=1}} {}_{m=1} {}^{x_1} m \sin \frac{4m}{{}_0} {}^{!} g_m (T) :$$
 (17)

Sem iclassically, this rst order result was already derived by M ontam baux [10].

In addition, our sem iclassical approach allows us to obtain the renormalization of the coupling constant [12{16}] due to the higher-order diagrams of the Cooper series. Including these diagrams amounts to using the full kernel K (t) in Eq. (10) instead of K 1 (t). Introducing the Laplace transform of K 1 (t),

$$\hat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{p}) = 4 \, {}_{0} \, {}_{\mathbf{n}=0}^{\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathrm{F}}} \frac{1}{\mathbf{pt}_{\mathrm{T}} + 2(2n+1)}$$
 (18)

 $(n_F = E_F = 2 = k_F L_T = 4)$ , K (t) is given by the inverse Laplace transform

$$K (t) = \frac{1}{2 \text{ i}} \int_{1}^{2} dp \, e^{+pt} \ln [1 + \hat{f}(p)]' \frac{1}{0 \ln (k_F L)} K_1(t) ; L = \min (v_F t; L_T = 4) : (19)$$

The last equality is valid when  $\ln k_{_{\rm F}}\,L=1$  which is certainly satis ed when  $\ln k_{_{\rm F}}\,l=1$ . Therefore, the higher-order term s m erely lead to a renorm alization of the coupling constant, thus reducing the predicted magnitude of the persistent current. In the high tem perature regime ( $L_T$   $L_m$ ) the coupling constant is renormalized to 1=ln( $k_{_{\rm F}}\,L_T=4$ ). Introducing  $L_m=v_{_{\rm F}}\,$  (m L)^2=4D, the average length of a trajectory disusing metimes around the ring, one gets at low temperature ( $L_T$   $L_m$ ) a replacement of 0 1 by 1=ln( $k_{_{\rm F}}\,L_m$ ). These two limits agree with results obtained diagram matically by Eckem [16].

We note that the functional form of the temperature dependence (exponential T { damping [15]) is in line with experiments  $\beta$ {5] while the amplitude of the persistent current with renormalized coupling constant is smaller than the experiments by a factor of 5.

# $E.Diusive two{dim ensional system s}$

Contrary to rings, the geometry imposes no shortest length for returning paths in singly { connected systems. One therefore expects a dierent temperature dependence of the magnetic response.

Consider a two-dimensional singly (connected di usive quantum dot. In view of the general renormalization property of di usive systems Eq. (19), the diagonal part of the thermodynamic potential from the entire Cooper series Eq. (10)] can be written as

Here we have used  $L = v_F t$  in (19) since the  $R^2$  factor ensures that the main contribution to the integral comes from  $t < t_T$ . In two dimensions the conditional return probability, entering into A, is conveniently expressed in terms of the Fourier transform [7]

$$P(r;r;t;A) = \frac{1}{4^{2}} dk k j e^{ikA} \frac{\exp(k j t)}{1 \exp(2k j t)}$$
(21)

from which one obtains

A (r;t;B) = 
$$\frac{1}{4} \frac{R (t=t_B)}{t}$$
: (22)

Here we introduced the magnetic time

$$t_{B} = \frac{0}{4 B D} = \frac{L_{B}^{2}}{4 D} : (23)$$

It is related to the square of the magnetic length  $L_R^2$  which denotes the area enclosing one ux quantum (assum ing di usive dynam ics). Note that the function R in Eq. (22) has a di erent origin than in Eq. (20).

U sing the expression (22) in Eq. (20) and taking the second derivative with respect to the eld, we nd for the susceptibility,

$$\frac{dt}{dt} = \frac{6}{100} (k_F l)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{dt}{dt} (k_F v_F t)^{\frac{1}{2}} R^2 \frac{t}{t_T} R^0 \frac{t}{t_R}$$
(24)

where  $R^{\,0}$  is the second derivative of R . The susceptibility is normalized to the two{ dim ensional diam agnetic Landau susceptibility  $L = \hat{e} = (12 \text{ m } \hat{e})$ .

In the above time integral the elastic scattering time  $e_{i} = 1 = v_{i}$  enters as a lower bound. This cuto must be introduced since for backscattered paths with times shorter than el the di usion approximation (21) no longer holds [20]. On the other hand Eq. (24) holds true only as long as the upper cuto time t m in (t; t) is smaller than the Thouless  $tim e t_c = L^2 = D$  (with L being the system size). For tim es larger than  $t_c$  the dynamics begins to behave ergodically, and the two-dimensional disusion approximation is no longer valid. A ssum ing  $t < t_c$ , Eq. (24) can be approximately evaluated by replacing R ( $t=t_T$ ) and  $R^{(0)}(t=t_{B})$  by R(0) = 1 and  $R^{(0)}(0) = 1$ 1=3, respectively, and introducing the upper cuto t

in the integral. The remaining integral yields for t
$$\frac{z}{t} \frac{dt}{t \ln (k_F v_F t)} = \ln \frac{\ln [k_F v_F m \ln (t_T; t_B)]}{\ln (k_F 1)}$$
(25)

The log-log form produced by the 1=tlnt dependence results from the wide distribution of path-lengths in the system { there are ux-enclosing paths with lengths ranging from about  $v_{r-el}$  up to  $v_{r}$  t. In contrast, in the ring geometry discussed in the previous section the temperature dependence is exponential because the minimum length of ux-enclosing tra jectories is the circum ference.

The averaged susceptibility of a di usive two{dim ensional structure then reads
$$\frac{\frac{\mathbb{D}}{\mathbb{J}_{L}}}{\mathbb{J}_{L}}, \frac{2}{\mathbb{J}_{L}} (k_{\mathbb{F}} \mathbb{I}) \ln \frac{\ln [k_{\mathbb{F}} \ v_{\mathbb{F}} \ \text{m in } (t_{\mathbb{T}}; t_{\mathbb{B}})]}{\ln (k_{\mathbb{F}} \mathbb{I})} : \tag{26}$$

One thus nds a log-log temperature dependence for  $t_{\rm T}$  <  $t_{\rm B}$  and a log-log B dependence for  $t_T > t_B$ . With regard to magnitude, the magnetic response of diusive systems is param agnetic and enhanced by a factor k, loom pared to the clean Landau susceptibility 1.

Eq. (26) agrees with results from Aslamazov and Larkin [12], Altshuler, Aronov and Zyuzin [13,14], and Oh, Zyuzin and Serota [17] obtained with quantum diagram matic perturbation theory. The equivalence between the sem iclassical and quantum approaches to di usive systems may be traced back to the fact that the \quantum "diagrammatic perturbation theory relies on the use of the small parameter  $1=k_{\rm p}$  1 which can be viewed as a sem iclassical approximation.

#### F.Conclusion

To conclude, we developed a sem iclassical approach to evaluate the interaction contribution of the grand potential in a high density perturbative expansion. We showed that the averaged quantum magnetic response can be expressed in terms of an operator containing the classical probability for particles to return. As an application we computed the orbital magnetic response of dissive rings and two (dimensional quantum dots arising from the combined elects of disorder and interaction.

RAJ and KR adknowledge support from the French-German program PROCOPE. The Division de Physique Theorique is  $\U$  nite de recherche des Universites Paris 11 et Paris 6 associee au CNR S.".

- [1] Electron-electron interactions in D isordered systems, edited by A. L. Efros and M. Pollak (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1985).
- [2] U. Sivan, R. Berkovits, Y. Aloni, O. Prus, A. Auerbach, and G. Ben (Yoseph, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 1123 (1996); O. Agam, N.S. W. ingreen, B.L. Altshuler, D.C. Ralph, and M. Tinkham, Phys. Rev. Lett. 78, 1956 (1997).
- [3] L.P. Levy, G. Dolan, J. Dunsmuir, and H. Bouchiat, Phys. Rev. Lett. 64, 2074 (1990).
- [4] V. Chandrasekhar, R.A. Webb, M.J. Brady, M.B. Ketchen, W.J. Gallagher, and A.Kleinsasser, Phys. Rev. Lett. 67, 3578 (1991).
- [5] P.M ohanty, E.M. Q. Jariwala, M. B. Ketchen, and R.A. Webb, in Quantum Coherence and Decoherence, edited by K. Fujikawa and Y.A. Ono (Elsevier, 1996).
- [6] For recent reviews see, e.g. U. Eckern and P. Schwab, Adv. Phys. 44, 387 (1995); K. Efetov, Supersymmetry in Disorder and Chaos, Cambridge University Press (1996).
- [7] N. Argaman, Y. Imry, and U. Smilansky, Phys. Rev. B 47, 4440 (1993).
- [8] F. von Oppen and E.K. Riedel, Phys. Rev. B 48, 9170 (1993); F. von Oppen, Phys. Rev. B 50, 17151 (1994).
- [9] D. Ullmo, K. Richter, and R. A. Jalabert, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, 383 (1995); K. Richter, D. Ullmo and R. A. Jalabert, Phys. Rep. 276, 1 (1996).
- [10] G.M ontam baux, Journal de Physique 6, 1 (1996).
- [11] D. Ullmo, H. J. Baranger, K. Richter, F. von Oppen, and R. A. Jalabert, Report No. cond-mat/9708092 and unpublished.
- [12] L.G. Aslam azov and A.I. Larkin, Sov. Phys. JETP 40, 321 (1975).
- [13] B L A Lishuler, A G. Aronov, and A Yu. Zyuzin, Sov. Phys.-JETP 57, 889 (1983).
- [14] For a review see B.L.A. Itshuler and A.G. Aronov in Ref. [1].
- [15] V. Ambegaokar and U. Eckem, Phys. Rev. Lett. 65, 381 (1990).
- [16] U. Eckem, Z. Phys. B 42, 389 (1991).
- [17] S.Oh, A.Yu. Zyuzin, and R.A. Serota, Phys. Rev. B 44, 8858 (1991).
- [18] A A . A brikosov, L P . G orkov, and I E . D zyaloshinski, M ethods of Q uantum Field Theory in Statistical Physics (Prentice Hall, Englewood C lifs, 1963).
- [19] Chaos and Quantum Physics, edited by M.-J. Giannoni, A. Voros, and J. Zinn-Justin (North-Holland, New York, 1991).
- [20] Shorter paths with t < el arise from higher order interaction events and contribute to the clean bulk magnetic response which however is negligible compared to the disorder induced interaction contribution [11].