On the Nature of Infrared Singularities in d 2 D isordered Interacting System s.

Anton Andreev^a, and Alex Kam enev^b

^a Institute for Theoretical Physics, ^bD epartment of Physics, University of California Santa Barbara, CA 93106-4030.

(April 15, 2024)

W eaddress the problem of infrared singularities in the perturbation theory for disordered interacting system s in d 2. We show that a typical, su ciently large interacting system exhibits a linear instability in the spin triplet channel. In the density (density channel, although stability is preserved, a large number of soft m odes is accumulated. These phenomena are responsible for the instability of the weak (interacting xed point. A lthough generic, the unstable direction and soft m odes are highly sample speci c and can not be e ectively captured by conventional techniques based on an averaging procedure. Rather, the instability is determined by the largest eigenvalues of the polarization operator. We propose to employ the optim al uctuation method for evaluating the probability of such events.

PACS numbers: 71.10 H f, 71.30 + h, 73.23 P s

The physics of two{dimensional (d = 2) disordered electronic systems has received a new impetus since the accumulation of experimental evidence of a metal{ insulator transition in zero magnetic eld [1]. O ther remarkable experimental developments are associated with d = 2 nite size structures { quantum dots [2]. The data indicate the crucial role of e{e interactions in these disordered (chaotic) systems. We also point out that in both cases spin degrees of freedom seem to play a major role.

On the theoretical side it was known since the work of A Itshuler and A ronov [3] that various physical observables acquire infrared singular corrections in the presence of e interactions. U sing a nite system size, L, as a cuto [4], one may write the correction to an observable,

(which m ay be speci c heat, conductivity, spin polarization etc.) as

$$- / \frac{L^{2 d}}{d^{D}}; \qquad (1)$$

where d is a d{dimensional density of states at a Ferm i level and D is a diusion constant. Hereafter, L^{2 d} should be understood as ln L=lw ith lbeing a m icroscopic length (m can free path [5]) for the d = 2 case. Once the system size becom es com parable with the characteristic $(_{d}D)^{1=(2 d)}$ $(_{2} = le^{2D})$, the validity of the length d rst order perturbation theory breaks down, and expression (1) can not be applied. Despite the fact that d has an interpretation as the localization length, Eq. (1) has nothing to do with the actual Anderson localization. In fact, in the presence of a sm all magnetic eld the physical localization length may be much larger than d. Thus, the behavior of an observable at L > d m ay be studied quite independently of the onset of the Anderson localization.

Finkel'stein [6,7] has developed a renormalization group approach to the problem. H is results show that a weak {disorder and weak { interaction xed point is unstable at d 2. As a result, the large scale behavior of the system is governed by some other xed point. He has also noticed that the system acquires a tendency towards a partial spin polarization and pointed out that the spin susceptibility diverges independently of all (and before) other quantities [7]. In spite of considerable further efforts in this direction [8{10}], the physical nature of the new xed point remains to a large extent unclear. The ultimate fate of the corrections, Eq. (1), in the region L > d is also unknown.

The purpose of this letter is to shed som e light on the above questions. We concentrate primarily on the spin triplet interaction channel, restricting ourselves to few remarks concerning spin singlet (density (density) channel. W e argue that for each particular realization of disorder and L > $_{\rm d}$ the system exhibits a linear response instability in the spin triplet channel. On the mean { eld level this instability leads to the spontaneous breaking of the spin { rotation symmetry and partial spin polarization. The questions concerning stability of true longrange order with respect to uctuations in the therm odynam ic lim it are well beyond the scope of this letter. For a nite size system at su ciently low temperatures, however, the uctuations will not destroy spontaneous magnetization. The existence of an unstable direction (in the functional space of possible spin polarizations) is a generic property of any disordered system . Its concrete shape, how ever, depends on the polarization operator for a given disorder realization and is extrem ely sam ple dependent. M ethods which employ an ensemble averaging procedure at an early stage of the calculations are bound to loose inform ation about this instability since they use the disorder-averaged polarization operator. Instead of being linear, the e ect appears to be encoded into higher non { linear corrections. The stability of the param agnetic state for a given system has very little to do with the averaged susceptibility. The importance of uctuations of various susceptibilities in disordered m etals was stressed by several authors [11,12] (see also [13] for applications to superconductors). In fact, the stability of the param agnetic state is determined by atypically large eigenvalues

of the polarization operator [12]. Thus, m ethods treating the optim al uctuations seem to be more adequate. These m ethods were initially developed for the problem of \Lifshitz tails" by Z ittartz and Langer [14] and used recently in the problem of pre{localized states [15]. Below we adopt them for the treatm ent of interacting electrons.

Consider a gas of interacting electrons, moving in a random potential. In terms of the slow degrees of freedom the interaction H am iltonian takes the form

$$H = \frac{1}{2_{d}}^{ZZ} d^{d}r d^{d}r^{0} V_{s} (r r^{0}) n (r) n (r^{0}) \tilde{V}_{t} s (r) s (r);$$
(2)

where the charge, $n(r) = {P \atop y}(r)$ (r), and spin, $s(r) = {P \atop y}(r) \quad 0 \quad 0$ (r), densities are slowly varying on the scale $_{F}$; $\hat{V_{t}} = V_{t}$ (r r^{0}). We write the partition function as an imaginary time functional integral [16] and perform the Hubbard {Stratonovich transform ation of the singlet and triplet interaction term s by means of elds and H correspondingly. Having in mind developing a Landau {G inzburg mean { eld theory at nite tem perature T, we restrict ourselves to the zero M atsubara frequency only, H (r) = H (r; !m = 0). The subsequent integration over the fermionic degrees of freedom results in det[1 + G (i + H)], which may be now expanded in powers of and H. In this way one obtains

^Z D H exp
$$\frac{d^{T}}{2}$$
 ^{ZZ} h (r) \hat{V}_{t}^{1} ^(r;r⁰) H (r⁰) + \hat{H}^{4} ;
(3)

where $^{H 4}$ designate non{linear terms. The central quantity of interest is the static polarization operator (PO), de ned as

$$(\mathbf{r};\mathbf{r}^{0}) = \int_{d}^{1} \mathbf{T} \int_{0}^{X} \mathbf{G}_{n} (\mathbf{r};\mathbf{r}^{0}) \mathbf{G}_{n} (\mathbf{r}^{0};\mathbf{r}); \qquad (4)$$

where G $_{n}$ (r;r⁰) is a sample speci c G reen function and $_{n} = T (2n + 1)$. The G aussian part of the functional integral, Eq. (3), becomes unstable if the positively dened H erm it ian operator $(r;r^{0})$ has at least one eigenvalue larger than V_{t}^{-1} . We are faced, thus, with the spectral problem for the PO:

$$Z d^{d}r^{0} (r; r^{0}) = n (r);$$
 (5)

R

j j²d^dr = 1. Speci cally, we are interested in the large tail of the PO spectral density since the spontaneous symmetry breaking will be determined by the largest eigenvalue. The spectral density is de ned as

where the angular brackets denote disorder averaging. Employing the optimal uctuation we shall dem onstrate that

N > typical / exp f
$$\frac{d^{D}}{L^{2 d}}$$
 ; (7)

with f (x) being a certain universal function (x^2 { in a simplest approximation). Eq. (7) demonstrates that the condition for the appearance of a large ($> V_t^{-1}$) eigenvalue is $L^{2-d} > {}_{d}D = V_t$ which coincides precisely with the breakdown of the perturbation theory, Eq. (1). It is clear now from Eq. (3) that once such an eigenvalue is formed, the system develops a non{trivial saddle point with H (r) \in 0, which describes a spin polarized state. A new expansion arround this sam ple{speci c m inim um should be developed.

The (replicated) ensemble averaged version of the effective action in Eq. (3) is

$$\frac{{}_{d}T}{2}^{ZZ} \stackrel{h}{H} \stackrel{i}{\hat{V}_{t}}^{1} \stackrel{h}{h}\stackrel{i}{H} + \stackrel{h}{h}\stackrel{i}{1} \frac{1}{4}hh^{2}ii H^{4} + \dots$$
(8)

The average PO, h $(r;r^{0})i = (r r^{0})$, is an operator with all eigenvalues equal to unity and thus with no tails in spectral density [17]. This fact ensures the stability of the Gaussian integral for $V_{t}^{1} > 1$, which is the Stoner criterion for the ferrom agnetic instability [18]. The information about anom alously large eigenvalues of ^ is now hidden in the higher order non { linear term s. Thus the basic fact about the presence of a linear instability in the theory appears to be obscured by the averaging procedure.

Let us make a few remarks concerning the singlet interaction channel. The corresponding functional integral over a scalar eld has a Gaussian part of the form

$$\frac{d^{T}}{2} d^{d}r d^{d}r^{0} (r) V_{s}^{1} (r r^{0}) + (r; r^{0})^{i} (r^{0}) : (9)$$

Note the plus sign in front of PO! The kernel is now strictly positively de ned and can not exhibit an instability. It may have, however, very soft (and long-wavelength) modes associated with a small (0) tail of the spectral density N () [19]. These atypically soft modes may lead to singularities in the singlet channel. One should be careful with these arguments, however, since there is no reason to neglect non {zero M atsubara frequencies in this situation. For $!_m > DQ^2$ even the average PO has small eigenvalues. The fact that the divergence of singlet and triplet quantities is associated with the opposite tails of N () may be related to F inkel'stein's results quoted above.

W e turn now to the evaluation of the tails of the PO spectral density, N (). To this end we de ne the corresponding G reen function operator as

$$\hat{G}(r;r^{0}) = (\hat{1})^{1} = \begin{pmatrix} X & n(r) & n(r^{0}) \\ n & i & n \end{pmatrix}$$
 (10)

and N () = $1 = Trh\hat{G}$ i. To perform disorder averaging we need to know the statistics of the random operator $(r; r^{0})$. A straightforw and diagram matic calculation of its second cumulant yields at T = 0

$$Q_{ss^{0}}^{rr^{0}}$$
 h^(r;r^{0})^(s^{0};s)ii = (11)
Z

$$\frac{1}{2^{2}} \operatorname{"d"D}_{"}(r \ s^{0}) D_{"}(s^{0} \ r^{0}) D_{"}(r^{0} \ s) D_{"}(s \ r):$$

 $\operatorname{Here} \operatorname{D}$, (r) is a propagator of the classical di usion operator

$$D_{"}(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{Q}^{X} \frac{e^{iQ\,r}}{D\,Q^{2} + \mathbf{j}^{"}\mathbf{j}} = \frac{L_{*}^{2\,d}}{D}F_{d} \frac{r}{L_{*}}; \quad (12)$$

where $L_{*} = {}^{p} \overline{D = "}$ and $F_{d}(x)$ is a dimensionless function with the assimptotic behavior $F_{d}(0) = \text{const}$ and $F_{d}(x \mid 1) = e^{x}$. Performing the energy integration in Eq. (11) one obtains

$$Q_{ss^{0}}^{rr^{0}} \frac{(_{d}D)^{2}}{(jr s^{0}j+js^{0} r^{0}j+jr^{0} sj+js r)^{4(d 1)}};$$
(13)

W e can perform now the averaging of the G reen function, \hat{G} , assuming the G aussian distribution for \hat{C} . This is certainly not an exact procedure because the higher order cum ulants of \hat{C} are not negligible in the most interesting parameter region L > $_{\rm d}$. We shall follow, how ever, this idea since it allows us to illustrate the method and provides a basis for further generalizations. We thus obtain

$$D = Z = Z = D^{\circ} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \int_{rr^{0}}^{rr^{0}} (Q^{-1}) \int_{ss^{0}}^{rr^{0}} \int_{ss^{0}}^{s} h \hat{G}^{\circ}(R;R^{0})};$$
(14)

where integration over repeated coordinates is in plicit. The average value of the PO is om itted in this expression, since it leads to a trivial rede nition ! 1 only. We argue now, following Zittartz and Langer [14], that large tails are determined by the saddle point of this functional integral. Variation over \hat{r}_{rr^0} leads to the equation for the optim al realization of the PO

$$(r;r^{0}) = Q_{ss^{0}}^{rr^{0}} \frac{\hat{G}(R;s)\hat{G}(s^{0};R^{0})}{\hat{G}(R;R^{0})} : \qquad (15)$$

In the close vicinity of some atypically large eigenvalue, $_0$, the G reen function may be well approximated by the single term in the sum, Eq. (10), \hat{G} (r;r⁰) = $_0$ (r) $_0$ (r⁰)=($_0$), leading to

$$(r;r^{0}) = \frac{1}{0} Q_{ss^{0}}^{rr^{0}} (s) (s^{0}) : \qquad (16)$$

A gain the d{dimensional integration is assumed over repeated coordinates. Finally, substitution of Eq. (16) into Eq. (5) results in the nonlinear self-consistency equation for the typical eigenfunction corresponding to a large eigenvalue, $_0$,

$$_{0 \quad 0}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{_{0}} Q_{ss^{0} \quad 0}^{rr^{0}} (\mathbf{r}^{0})_{0}(\mathbf{s})_{0}(\mathbf{s}^{0}) : \qquad (17)$$

To avoid the solution of this non{linear integral equation one may use purely dimensional arguments. To this end let us write this equation in terms of dimensionless coordinates x = r=L and dimensionless eigenfunctions $_{0}(x) = L^{d=2}$ $_{0}(r)$. We also employ Eq. (13) for the cumulant Q:

$${}^{"}_{0}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\frac{\mathbf{L}^{2 \ d}}{d\mathbf{D}} \frac{\mathbf{H}_{2}}{\mathbf{0}(\mathbf{0})}}{\left(\frac{\mathbf{x}}{\mathbf{y}}^{0}\mathbf{y}^{0}\mathbf{d}^{d}\mathbf{y}^{d}\mathbf{d}^{d}\mathbf{y}^{0}}{(\mathbf{x}^{0})}\right)}$$
(18)
$${}^{2^{1}}\frac{\mathbf{d}^{d}\mathbf{x}^{0}\mathbf{d}^{d}\mathbf{y}\mathbf{d}^{d}\mathbf{y}^{0}}{(\mathbf{x}^{0}\mathbf{y}^{0}\mathbf$$

To ensure the existence of a normalizable $R_{j_0 j_0} d^d x = 1$ solution of this equation one must require that the expression in the square brackets on its rhs. is of order unity. We conclude that

$${}_{0} {}_{0}{}^{1} {}_{d} {}^{\frac{L^{2} d}{dD}} {}^{2} :$$
 (19)

The last step is to nd the statistical weight of the optimal realization , which has $_0$ as an eigenvalue. Its statistical weight is obviously given by Q⁻¹ = $_0=(_0)$, where we employed Eqs. (16), (17) and normalization condition for $_0$. The last expression together with Eq. (19) implies that

$$(\ _{d} D \ _{d} D$$

where c_d is a numerical constant of order unity. The fact that G aussian tails are obtained m ay be traced back to the assumption about the G aussian distribution of the PO and should not be taken too seriously in the regime L > $_d$. However, the dependence of the spectral density on the parameter $_dD = L^{2 d}$ follows from pure dimensional analysis and m ay be justiled formore realistic assumptions concerning PO statistics. In fact, the G aussian spectral density, Eq. (20), is the most pessimistic estimate for the tails. Indeed, all the e ects we have neglected (higher order cumulants of ^, and onset of Anderson localization) should increase uctuations of the PO, m aking the tails decrease slower than G aussian.

It remains a challenging problem to calculate the spectral density of the PO under more realistic assumptions. The \pessim istic" result, Eq. (20), is already su cient to demonstrate our main point: one may nd an arbitrarily large eigenvalue of the PO if the system size is taken to be large enough. This leads to a ferrom agnetic instability in the triplet channel for arbitrarily sm all interaction, V_t .

In the most interesting d = 2 case the argument in Eq. (20) has the form $_0 g (\ln L=1)^{-1}$, where $g = _2D > 1$ is a dimensionless conductance of a 2d metal. To nd an eigenvalue of the PO $_0 > V_t^{-1} > 1$ one should typically consider a sample with a size, L > lexpfg=V_tg. This still may be much smaller than the localization length in the unitary ensemble, which is of the order lexpfg²g. This is to say that, contrary to a naive interpretation of Eq. (20), onem ay encounter the ferror agnetic instability well inside the metallic side of the Anderson transition.

W e want to point out that in low dimensional (d 2) system s the spontaneous symmetry breaking occures into an extended state, rather than into a localized one (as it happens in 3d systems [12]). This is clear from the extended nature the solution of Eq. (18). In this case the role of nonlinear terms (H⁴ in Eq. (3)) reduces to merely determining the amplitude of the spontaneous globally coherent magnetization.

The aim of this letter is to elucidate the source of som e problems in the theory of d 2 disordered interacting electrons. The traditional perturbation theory and RG treatment lead to infrared divergence and instability of the weak { coupling xed point correspondingly. They do not provide a sim ple physical reason for the singularities, nor do they explain the nature of the strong coupling xed point. W e argue that at least som e of the di culties can be traced to (i) the ferrom agnetic instability of a given system in the triplet channel, and (ii) to the accumulation of many soft modes in the singlet channel. The latter necessitates taking into account non{linear terms in the action. Both the unstable directions and the soft modes, although generic, are sample specic and do not survive (traditional) ensemble averaging procedure. It would be desirable to construct a theory, which

rst adjusts the integration directions (bosonic elds) to the concrete sample con guration and only then perform s the averaging.

D iscussions with I.A leiner, A.A ltland, B.L.A ltshuler, R.N.Bhatt, I.V.Lemer, S.Sachdev and B.Sim ons are highly acknow ledged. This research was supported by the NSF G rant No.PHY 94-07194. A K. was partially supported by the Rothschild fellow ship.

- [1] S.V.K ravchenko et al., Phys. Rev. B 63, 8039 (1994);
 D. Simonian et al., Phys. Rev. B 55, 13421 (1997);
 S.V.K ravchenko et al., cond-m at/9709255; D.Popovic,
 A.B.Fowler, and S.W ashburn, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 1543 (1997); Y.Hanein et al., cond-m at/9709184.
- [2] J.A. Folk et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 1699 (1996);
 S.R.Patelet al, cond-m at/9708090.
- [3] B.L.Altshuler, and A.G.Aronov, Zh.Eksp.Teor.Fiz.
 77,2028 (1979) [Sov.Phys.JETP 50,968 (1979)]; B.L.
 Altshuler and A.G.Aronov, in Electron [Electron Interaction In Disordered Systems, ed. A. J. Efros, and M.Pollak, pp.1{153, Elsevier Science Publishers, North { Holand, 1985.
- [4] A lternately one m ay think about in nite system and use a temperature length, L_T D = T, as cuto .
- [5] As pointed out by A. M. Rudin, I. L. Aleiner, and L. I. Glazman, Phys. Rev. B 55, 9322 (1997), the actual ultraviolet cuto in the logarithm should rather be F than 1.
- [6] A.M. Finkel'stein, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 84, 168 (1983) [Sov. Phys. JETP 57, 97 (1983)]; A.M. Finkel'stein, Electron Liquid in Disordered Conductors, v. 14 of Soviet scienti c reviews, ed. I.M. Khalatnikov, Harwood A cadem ic Publishers Gm bH, London, 1990;
- [7] A.M.Finkel'stein, Z.Phys.B, 56, 189 (1984).
- [8] D.Belitz, and T.R.Kirkpatrick, Rev. Mod. Phys. 66, 261 (1994).
- [9] C.Castellani, and C.DiCastro, Phys. Rev. B 34, 5935 (1986).
- [10] S. Sachdev, N. Read, and R. Opperm ann, Phys. Rev. B 52, 10286 (1995).
- [11] A.Zyuzin, B.Spivak, JETP Lett. 43, 234 (1986); B.Spivak, A.Zyuzin, in M esoscopic Phenom ena in Solids, Eds.
 B.L.Altshuler, P.A.Lee and R.A.Webb p. 37, Elsevier Science Publishers, North (Holand, 1991.
- [12] M.M ilovanovic, S.Sachdev and R.N.Bhatt, Phys.Rev. Lett. 63, 82 (1989).
- [13] B.Spivak and F.Zhou, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, 2800 (1995).
- [14] J.Zittartz, and J.S.Langer, Phys. Rev. 148, 741 (1966).
- [15] B.A.M uzykantskii, and D.E.Khm el'nitskii, Phys.Rev. B 51, 5480, (1995); V.I.Fal'ko, K.B.Efetov, J.M ath. Phys. 37, 4935 (1997); I.E.Sm olyarenko, B.L.Altshuler, Phys.Rev.B 55, 10451 (1997).
- [16] J.W. Negele, and H.Orland, Quantum Many{Particle System s, Addison-Wesley Pub.Co., 1988.
- [17] In fact, $h^{2}i(r r^{0})$ has smaller eigenvalues associated with eigenfunctions oscillating at $2k_{F}$, which are not in – portant in the present context.
- [18] S.D oniach, and E.H.Sondheim er, G reen's functions for solid state physicists, Reading, Mass., W.A.Benjamin, 1974.
- [19] One should actually be interested in small eigenvalues of the operator V_s ¹ + ^. In the case of the Coulomb interaction, this is similar to searching for long-wavelength soft modes of ^.