

Integrable Circular Brane Model and Coulomb Charging at Large Conduction

Sergei L. Lukyanov and Alexander B. Zamolodchikov

NHETC, Department of Physics and Astronomy
Rutgers University
Piscataway, NJ 08855-0849, USA

and

L.D. Landau Institute for Theoretical Physics
Chemogolovka, 142432, Russia

Abstract

We study a model of 2D QFT with boundary interaction, in which two-component massless Bose field is constrained to a circle at the boundary. We argue that this model is integrable at two values of the topological angle, $\theta = 0$ and $\theta = \pi$. For $\theta = 0$ we propose exact partition function in terms of solutions of ordinary linear differential equation. The circular brane model is equivalent to the model of quantum Brownian dynamics commonly used in describing the Coulomb charging in quantum dots, in the limit of small dimensionless resistance g_0 of the tunneling contact. Our proposal translates to partition function of this model at integer charge.

1 The model

In this note we address a model of 2D Euclidean field theory with boundary interaction which we call the circular brane model. The model contains two-component Bose field $X(z; \bar{z}) = X^1(z; \bar{z}); X^2(z; \bar{z})$ defined on a disk of a radius R with usual complex coordinates $(z; \bar{z})$, $|z| \leq R$. Its bulk dynamics is that of a free massless field, as described by the action

$$A_{\text{disk}} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{|z| \leq R} d^2z \partial_z X \partial_{\bar{z}} X \quad (1)$$

($d^2z = dx dy$), but it obeys nonlinear boundary condition

$$X_B^2 = \frac{1}{g_0}; \quad (2)$$

where X_B stands for the values of X at the boundary $|z| = R$, and g_0 is a coupling constant. Due to the nonlinear boundary condition, the theory needs renormalization. It has to be equipped with the ultraviolet (UV) cutoff, and consistent removal of the UV divergences requires that the bare coupling constant g_0 be given a dependence of the cutoff momentum, according to the Renormalization Group (RG) flow equation

$$\frac{dg_0}{d} = -2g_0^2 - 4g_0^3 + \dots : \quad (3)$$

The leading two terms of the beta function written down in (3) were computed in [1] and [2], and indeed agree with the more general calculations in [3] and [4]. Eq.(3) shows that the theory is asymptotically free (at short distances the effective size of the circle (2) becomes large. It is believed that the theory develops a physical energy scale E , and at the distances $l = E^{-1}$ from the boundary the effect of the boundary is that of the fixed boundary condition $X_B = 0$ (the boundary (2) "flows" to the Dirichlet boundary). According to the equation (3)

$$E \sim g_0^{-1} e^{\frac{1}{2g_0}} : \quad (4)$$

As usual, the effect of the boundary can be described in terms of the boundary state [5]. The boundary state $|B\rangle$ is a special vector in the space of states of radial quantization (in our case the space of states of two-component free massless Bose field on a circle of the circumference $2\pi R$). This state incorporates all information about the boundary conditions; any correlation function can be written in terms of the Euclidean-time Heisenberg operators sandwiched between $|B\rangle$ and the radial-quantization vacuum

j_0 i. In particular, the overlap $\langle j_0 | j_B \rangle$ coincides with the disk partition function, up to the factor R^{c-6} . In our case j_0 i is the Fock vacuum of the free massless field $X(z; \bar{z})$ with the zero-mode momentum $P = 0$. More generally, we will be interested in the overlap amplitude $\langle P | j_B \rangle$, where j_P i is the Fock vacuum with the zero-mode momentum P ; of course, this amplitude relates to the (unnormalized) one point correlation function of the exponential field inserted at the center of the disk,

$$\langle P | j_B \rangle = R^{c-6+P^2/2} \langle e^{iP X}(0;0) \rangle_{\text{disk}} : \quad (5)$$

Here $c = 2$ is the central charge of the bulk theory. It will be convenient to transform the spherical brane model to the geometry of semi-infinite cylinder, using the standard exponential map:

$$z=R = e^{u=R} ; \quad \bar{z}=R = e^{u=R} ; \quad (6)$$

where $u = \tau + i\sigma$; $u = \tau - i\sigma$, with σ ranging from $-\pi$ to π , and τ being a periodic coordinate with the period 2π . In what follows we will write (with some abuse of notations) $X(\sigma; \tau)$ for the field X in (1) expressed in terms of these cylindrical coordinates. Then, introducing the shifted field variable

$$Y(\sigma; \tau) = X(\sigma; \tau) + \frac{i}{R} P \sigma ; \quad (7)$$

one can relate the the amplitude $\langle P | j_B \rangle$ to the partition function¹:

$$Z(R; H) = \lim_{H \rightarrow 1} \frac{1}{2} e^{\frac{P^2}{4R}} \int_{\mathcal{D}} dY e^{-A_{\text{cyl}}[Y]} ; \quad (8)$$

where the integration field variable $Y(\sigma; \tau)$ is still subject to the circular brane constraint

$$Y_B^2 = \frac{1}{g_0} ; \quad (9)$$

and

$$A_{\text{cyl}}[Y] = \frac{1}{4} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} d\sigma \int_0^H d\tau \left(\partial_\sigma Y \partial_\sigma Y + \partial_\tau Y \partial_\tau Y \right) \quad (10)$$

¹The factor 2 in (8) is added partly to eliminate the spurious boundary degeneracy of the auxiliary Neumann boundary at $\tau = \pi$ in (10), and partly to take into account the infrared boundary entropy of the real boundary at $\tau = 0$; with this normalization the $R \rightarrow 1$ behavior of $Z(R; H)$ is e^{-2/R^2} , with the coefficient 1.

Here and below H stands for $R_2 R$. The "external field" H relates to P in (5) as

$$H = \frac{iP}{4R}; \quad (11)$$

and the argument H in the r.h.s. of (8) is $P \overline{H^2}$. Thus

$$\ln P \cdot j_B i = \frac{1}{2} Z(R; H); \frac{P \overline{P^2}}{4R}; \quad (12)$$

where the factor $\frac{1}{2}$ is the boundary degeneracy [6] of the infrared (Dirichlet) fixed point. We note that by the nature of the boundary condition (9) the partition function $Z(R; H)$ is expected to be an entire function of H , and its analytic continuation to pure imaginary H is unambiguous. In the form (10) the model has interpretation as 1+1 QFT on a half-line, at the temperature $T = \frac{1}{2R}$. At $R \rightarrow 1$ the partition function (8) develops standard linear asymptotic

$$\ln Z(R; H) \sim 2RE(H) \text{ as } R \rightarrow 1; \quad (13)$$

where $E(H)$ is the boundary energy. This quantity depends on H and g_0 , the latter dependence being through the energy scale E , Eq.(4). We found it convenient to fix overall normalization of E relating it to the zero temperature susceptibility,

$$\frac{1}{E} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 E}{\partial H^2} \Big|_{H=0}; \quad (14)$$

The circular brane model shows many similarities with the $O(3)$ sigma model (or n-field), the asymptotic freedom (3) being just one of them [7]. Another similarity is apparent when one observes that the field configurations $Y(\cdot; \cdot)$ in (8) can be separated into the topological classes characterized by the integer-valued winding number

$$w = \frac{g_0}{2} \int_{\partial Y_B} \wedge \partial Y_B; \quad (15)$$

just like the sigma-model field configurations fall into their topological classes characterized by the mapping degree $S^2 \rightarrow S^2$. Moreover, in the sigma-model the instanton configurations minimizing the action in each topological sector are found explicitly in terms of rational functions [8]; very similar expressions exist for the instanton configurations in the circular brane model [9,10]. The calculations of the instanton determinants [11] also

exhibit much similarity [12]{14]. As usual, existence of the integer-valued topological charge allows one to introduce another parameter, the topological angle θ ,

$$Z = \sum_{w \in 2\mathbb{Z}} Z^{(w)} e^{i w \theta}; \quad (16)$$

where the partition functions $Z^{(w)}$ are the functional integrals (8) taken over the field configurations in the topological class w only. The full partition function Z , as defined by Eq.(8), involves all topological sectors with equal weights, i.e. $Z = Z_{=0}$. It is this $= 0$ partition function which we had in mind in defining the boundary energy $E(H)$ and the energy scale E through (13),(14).

One of the reasons we mention this analogy here is because the $O(3)$ sigma model is known to be integrable at two special values of the topological angle, $\theta = 0$ and $\theta = \pi$ [15]{18]. Therefore it is natural to expect that the circular brane model is also integrable at these two special values of θ^2 . We argue in Appendix that for these values of θ the model admits a number of nontrivial higher-spin local integrals of motion. In fact, our argument there goes for the whole class of the $O(N)$ spherical brane models², with N -component field X , subject to the spherical brane boundary condition (2). Moreover, in these models it is possible to describe the whole set of the local integrals of motion I_{2k-1} , $k = 1; 2; 3; \dots$ in some details.

The aim of this note is to present a proposal for the exact form of the partition function (8) at the integrable point $\theta = 0$ in terms of solutions of certain ordinary differential equation. We will present this in the next section, but let us first make some remark and introduce suitable notations. As was mentioned above, renormalization trades the bare coupling constant g_0 for the RG invariant scale (4), and the partition function actually depends on the dimensionless combination RE . In fact, in the circular brane model (as well as in the $O(3)$ sigma model) the last statement is not entirely true. As was observed in [12], the functional integral (8) has a specific non-perturbative divergence due to the small-size instantons, which cannot be absorbed into the renormalization of the coupling constant g_0 . Due to this effect, the partition function (8) is expected to have the form

$$Z = e^{L \cos \theta} Z(\theta; h); \quad (17)$$

²It is worth mentioning here that the case $\theta = \pi$ is of special interest. In this case the circular brane model flows to a nontrivial conformal boundary condition which is believed to be related to the infrared fixed point of two-channel $\text{spin-}\frac{1}{2}$ Kondo model in its interacting sector [19].

where

$$L = A \log B(g_0) = E \quad ; \quad (18)$$

and

$$= 2 R E \quad ; \quad h = 2 R H \quad ; \quad (19)$$

Here A is a constant, which is universal (actually $A = 2$), but $B(g_0)$ is not { it depends on the details of UV cut-off. The factor Z depends on the RG invariant parameters g , h and μ only. Similar nonperturbative small-instanton divergence is well known to be present in the $O(3)$ sigma model [11], where it is blamed, for instance, for the violation of the normal scaling of the topological susceptibility [20]. It is important to note that the small instanton divergence does not affect the h -dependence of the free energy (interaction of small instantons with the external field H is negligible), therefore the energy scale E defined through (13) and (14) enjoys the normal RG behavior (4). In what follows we discuss the universal factor $Z(g, h)$ in the full partition function at $\mu = 0$,

$$Z(R, H) = e^L Z(g, h); \quad (20)$$

which carries all interesting dependence on H and R . Since any factor of the form e^{const} can be absorbed into the redefinition of $B(g_0)$ in (18), we fix the ambiguity by assuming that $Z(g, 0) \neq 1$ as $\mu \rightarrow 1$. With this convention, the boundary energy can be written as

$$E(H) = LE + E(H); \quad (21)$$

where $E(0) = 0$.

2 The partition function

It was discovered some years ago in Ref. [21] that in the case of the boundary flow in the minimal CFT with integrable boundary perturbation [22], the overlap analogous to (5) can be related exactly to the eigenvalue problem of certain ordinary differential operator. Despite the fact that this relation was proven [23], and similar relations were found in other integrable models of CFT with non-conformal boundary interactions [24, 25], its deeper reason remains a mystery to us. Nonetheless, it looks natural to assume that it might be a general phenomenon, and try to identify associated differential operator

for the circular brane model. Below we simply present our proposals for such differential operator. The motivations came from detailed studies of somewhat more general, but still integrable "brane" model (we call it the "paperclip brane model"); it generalizes the circular model in a way similar to the "sausage" deformation of the $O(3)$ sigma model [26]. We will report these studies elsewhere [27].

Consider the following ordinary differential equation

$$-\partial_v^2 \psi + \frac{1}{2} \exp(-\psi) + h^2 \exp(-\psi) = 0 : \quad (22)$$

Let $\psi_-(v)$ be the solution which decays at large negative v ,

$$\psi_-(v) \sim -\ln v \quad \text{as } v \rightarrow -\infty : \quad (23)$$

Also, let $\psi_+(v)$ be the solution decaying at large positive v ,

$$\psi_+(v) \sim \exp\left(-\frac{v}{2}\right) + \text{Ei}\left(-\frac{v}{2}\right) \quad \text{as } v \rightarrow +\infty ; \quad (24)$$

where $\text{Ei}(x)$ is the integral exponent function, $\text{Ei}(x) = \int_{-\infty}^x \frac{e^t}{t} dt$. The asymptotics (23) and (24) specify the solutions $\psi_-(v)$ and $\psi_+(v)$ uniquely, including their normalizations. Then

$$Z(\psi; h) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{(2e^{\psi} - 2)}{(1 + 2)} W_+ ; \quad (25)$$

where W_+ is the Wronskian $\psi_+ \partial_v \psi_- - \psi_- \partial_v \psi_+$ and $\psi_- = 0.577216 \dots$ is Euler's constant. Thus determination of Z reduces to the problem of the ordinary differential equation.

3 Low temperature expansion

At large R (low temperatures) the equation (22) can be studied using WKB expansion. The leading WKB approximation yields explicit expression for the boundary energy (21),

$$E(H) = E_0 + \int_0^{\infty} \frac{dt}{t} \ln \frac{1}{e^t + t(H - E_0)^2} e^{-t} : \quad (26)$$

Note that the integral admits the expansion in powers of H^2 ,

$$E(H) = E_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} C_k \frac{H^2}{E_0} ; \quad (27)$$

with

$$C_k = \frac{(-1)^k}{2^k} - \frac{(k - \frac{1}{2})}{k} \left(k - \frac{1}{2} \right)^{-k} ;$$

This expansion should be understood in terms of the expansion (66), with the powers h^{2k} representing the highest order terms h^{2k} of the polynomials I_{2k-1} , the vacuum eigenvalues of the local IM I_{2k-1} . Note that the above expression for the coefficients C_k is consistent with (71). The next order of the WKB expansion provides leading correction to the linear asymptotic (13),

$$\log Z = -2RE - \frac{1}{2R} E_2 + O(R^{-3}) ; \quad (28)$$

where, by direct calculation,

$$E_2 = \frac{1}{48H} \frac{\partial}{\partial H} H \frac{\partial E}{\partial H} ; \quad (29)$$

Again, expanding (28) in powers of H we have

$$\log Z = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} C_k (2E)^{1-2k} I_{2k-1} ; \quad (30)$$

with

$$I_{2k-1} = \frac{1}{R^{2k-1}} h^{2k} + \frac{k^2}{12} h^{2k-2} + \dots ; \quad (31)$$

in perfect agreement with Eqs.(66),(69). Further terms in (31) can be obtained by computing yet higher orders of the WKB expansion. This way one finds

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \frac{1}{R} h^2 + \frac{1}{12} ; \\ I_3 &= \frac{1}{R^3} h^4 + \frac{1}{3} h^2 + \frac{1}{40} ; \\ I_5 &= \frac{1}{R^5} h^6 + \frac{3}{4} h^4 + \frac{19}{100} h^2 + \frac{71}{5040} ; \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

again in agreement with (68).

4 High temperature expansion

It is also possible to develop short distance (high temperature) expansion of the partition function (25). For small β the solutions $\psi_-(v)$ and $\psi_+(v)$ can be evaluated using appropriate versions of perturbation theory. To make the resulting formulae compact we shall describe here these expansions in the case $\hbar = 0$ only. The solution $\psi_-(v)$ can be written as

$$\psi_-(v) = e^{-v} \left(1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n(\beta) e^{nv} \right); \quad (33)$$

where the coefficients $a_n(\beta) = O(\beta^n)$ and admit systematic expansions in powers of β . The $\beta \rightarrow 0$ expansion of the solution $\psi_+(v)$ is more subtle. Instead of powers of β , it expands in powers of the "running coupling constant" $g = g(\beta)$ defined by the equation

$$\beta = g^{-1} e^{\frac{1}{2g}}; \quad (34)$$

After change of variables

$$v = gx - \log(g) \quad (35)$$

the equation (22) becomes

$$\left(\frac{d}{dx} \right)^2 \psi + e^x \psi + U(x) \psi = 0; \quad (36)$$

where

$$U(x) = \exp \left(\frac{e^{gx}}{g} \right) e^x; \quad (37)$$

For $|x| \gg 1$ the term $U(x)$ is $O(g)$; in this domain solutions of (36) admit systematic expansion in powers of g . Expansion of ψ_+ is obtained by iterations of (36), starting with $\psi_+^{(0)} = C(g) K_0(2e^{x/2})$, where K_0 is the MacDonald function and the normalization constant $C(g)$ must be adjusted to match the asymptotic form (24). It turns out that both expansions, of ψ_- in the powers of β , and of ψ_+ in the powers of g , have common domain of validity at $v \gg \log(g)$, and can be used there for evaluation of the Wilsonian in (25). As the result, the following form of the small β expansion of the partition function (20) emerges

$$Z(R; 0) \sim e^{2 \log(2B(g_0)R)} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{g^n}{n!} z_n(g); \quad (38)$$

where the coefficients $z_n(g)$ are power series in g . The term $n = 0$ in (38) should be interpreted as the perturbative contribution to the partition function, the term $n = 1$ corresponds to the one-instanton contribution, and the higher nonperturbative terms $n = 2, 3, \dots$ presumably describe the contributions of multiple instanton and anti-instanton configurations. Explicit computation along the lines described above yields

$$\begin{aligned} z_0(g) &= 1 - (1 + \epsilon_E)g + O(g^2); \\ z_1(g) &= \log(2) - 2 + 3\epsilon_E - 2\epsilon_E g - 2(2 + \epsilon_E)g^2 + O(g^3); \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

5 Dissipative quantum rotator

The circular brane model has useful interpretation in terms of Brownian dynamics of quantum rotator. It was noticed a while ago in Ref. [28] that the free massless bulk dynamics (10) is equivalent to the Caldeira-Leggett model of quantum thermostat [29]. Upon fixing the boundary values $Y_B(\cdot)$ and integrating out the bulk part of the field $Y(\cdot; \cdot)$, Eq.(8) reduces to

$$Z(R; H) = \int_{\mathcal{Z}} D e^{-A_{\text{diss}}[\cdot]}; \quad (40)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\text{diss}}[\cdot] &= \frac{2H}{\epsilon_0} \int_0^I d\varphi \cos(\varphi) + \\ &\quad \frac{1}{8\pi^2 R^2 g_0} \int_0^I d\varphi \int_0^I d\varphi' \frac{\sin^2 \frac{(\varphi) - (\varphi')}{2}}{\sin^2 \left(\frac{\varphi - \varphi'}{2R} \right)}; \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

where (φ) is the angular field defined through $H = Y_B(\varphi) = H = \frac{p}{g_0} \cos(\varphi)$. The model similar³ to (41) was introduced in [30] (see e.g. [31] for a review) as an effective field theory describing tunneling of quasiparticles between superconductors. More recently it was subject of much interest in studying of the phenomenon of Coulomb blockade in quantum dots [32], in the regime where the dimensionless resistance of the tunneling contact g_0 is small [2, 12, 14, 33]. In this context, the effective action in fact contains another term,

$$A_{CB} = A_{\text{diss}} + \frac{1}{4E_C} \int_0^I d\varphi \varphi^2; \quad (42)$$

where E_C has the meaning of the charging energy of the dot in the absence of the tunneling, $E_C = e^2/2C$. Of course, τ_C is the Matsubara time, and

³The model of [30] has the potential term $\cos(2\varphi)$ instead of $\cos(\varphi)$ in (41).

$2R = 1/T$, the inverse temperature. When $T \rightarrow E_C$ this term just provides explicit UV cut-off, with the cut-off energy

$$= E_C = g_0 : \quad (43)$$

With the cut-off procedure thus specified, the "small-instanton" factor e^L in (20) becomes unambiguous. By comparing (38), (39) with direct one-instanton calculation in (42) [12, 14] one finds for small g_0

$$L = \frac{1}{g_0} + 5 \log(g_0) + O(1) : \quad (44)$$

Eqs. (20), (25) then provide the partition function of the model (42) at $\beta = 0$, in the limit of small g_0 . One only has to relate the energy scale E in (19) to the parameters g_0 and E_C in the above action (42). When $E_C = g_0$ and g_0 is small, the boundary energy $E(H)$ (21) can be computed directly from (42), using the standard perturbation theory in g_0 . By developing two-loop order in this perturbative expansion and comparing it with the $H = E_C$ behavior of the integral in (26), we found

$$E = \frac{E_C}{2} e^{\frac{1}{2g_0}} \left(1 - \frac{3}{4} g_0 + O(g_0^2) \right) : \quad (45)$$

Finally, let us make a remark on the topological susceptibility in the model (42). As was already mentioned, the topological susceptibility

$$E_C = -\frac{1}{R} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial^2} \log(Z) \Big|_{H=0} \quad (46)$$

in the circular brane model suffers from the small-instanton divergence, which leads to the non-universal factor e^L in (17). On the other hand, in applications to the Coulomb blockade, the topological susceptibility in (42) has direct physical meaning: it coincides with measurable capacitive energy of the quantum dot. Explicit cut-off in the action (42) makes the small-instanton factor unambiguous. According to (17), at zero temperature and zero H , E_C has the form $2^{-2} (L + \text{const}) E_C$, where the constant comes from the β -dependence of the second factor in (17). Since our proposal is strictly limited to the case $\beta = 0$, it does not allow for determination of this constant. However, at small g_0 the dominating contribution comes from the term LE , and therefore in view of (44) and (45), the charging energy at zero temperature is estimated as

$$E_C \Big|_{T=0} = \frac{E_C}{2} e^{\frac{1}{2g_0}} \left(\frac{1}{g_0} + 5 \log g_0 + O(1) \right) : \quad (47)$$

Of course, the leading behavior ($1=g_0$ in the brackets) here is consistent with the one-instanton analysis in the Gaussian approximation [12,14]. Nontrivial prediction which follows from our proposal is the logarithmic term in (47).

6 On other spherical brane models

The circular brane model is a particular case $N = 2$ of the " $O(N)$ spherical brane model", the latter containing N -component field X , subject to the same boundary condition (2), so that $X_B \in S^{N-1}$ [1]. As we argue in Appendix, the spherical brane model is integrable for any $N \geq 1$. Although the bulk part of this paper is devoted to the circular case $N = 2$, here we would like to say few words about other cases. First, for generic $N \neq 2$ there are no topological sectors, and the small-instanton divergence is not present. For $N \neq 2$ the overlap (5) ($c = N$) can be written as

$$\langle P | B | i = 2^{\frac{N}{4}} e^{-C_0} Z(\cdot; h); \quad (48)$$

where β and h are still the dimensionless parameters (19), and E is defined in Eq.(14). The factor $Z(\cdot; h)$ here is normalized as in (20), i.e. $Z(\cdot; 0) = 1$ as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$, and the N -dependent constant C_0 is the same as in Eqs. (66), (70).

For generic N we were not able to find differential equations which could possibly generate the overlap (48), as (22) does for $N = 2$. However, for two other cases, $N = 1$ and $N = 3$, representations of the function Z in (48) in terms of solutions of certain differential equations exist. Here we would like to describe what these differential equations are.

For $N = 1$, it is useful to note that the model is equivalent to the interacting sector of the one-channel spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ Kondo model. At $N = 1$ the sphere degenerates to two points, which represent two states of the impurity spin. Exact equivalence is established by bosonizing the Kondo fermions (see e.g. Ref. [34]). As is well known, the Kondo model is solvable by means of Bethe ansatz technique [35,36]. Alternative (and equivalent) representation of the partition function can be given in terms of the solutions of the differential equation [25]

$$\left(\frac{d}{dv} + 2^{-\frac{1}{2}} v e^v \right)^N \psi(v) = 0 : \quad (49)$$

The function Z coincides with associated Stokes multiplier (see [25] for the details).

For $N = 3$, consider the differential equation

$$\partial_v^2 + \frac{2}{v^2} e^{v^2/2} + h^2 \partial_v^2 (v) = 0 : \quad (50)$$

Let ψ_+ and ψ_- be its solutions uniquely determined by the asymptotics

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_+ &\sim \exp\left(-\frac{v^2}{8}\right) \text{Er}\left(\frac{v}{2}\right) \quad \text{as } v \rightarrow +1 ; \\ \psi_- &\sim \exp\left(-\frac{v^2}{8}\right) \text{Er}\left(-\frac{v}{2}\right) \quad \text{as } v \rightarrow -1 ; \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

where $\text{Er}(x)$ is the imaginary error function, $\text{Er}(x) = \frac{2}{\pi} \int_0^x dt e^{-t^2}$. The suggested relation is

$$Z(\pm i; h) = (2^{-P})^{1/2} W_{\pm} ; \quad (52)$$

Like in the case $N = 2$, the $h \rightarrow 1$ expansion of (52) can be obtained by WKB analysis of the solutions of (51). Thus, the leading WKB approximation yields the boundary energy (70), with the coefficients C_k given exactly by (71) with $N = 3$. Moreover, higher orders of the WKB expansion reproduce the eigenvalues (68), (69) perfectly.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to acknowledge useful conversations with L.B. Ioffe and M.V. Feigelman. SLL is grateful to A.M. Tsvelik for interesting discussions. ABZ thanks A.B. Zamolodchikov and P.B. Weigmann for sharing their insights.

The research is supported in part by DOE grant # DE-FG 02-96 ER 40949. SLL also acknowledges a support from Institute for Strongly Correlated and Complex Systems at BNL where the final part of this work was done.

7 Appendix

7.1 The $O(N)$ spherical brane model

In this appendix we present arguments in favor of integrability of the circular brane model at $\beta = 0$ and $\beta = \infty$. In fact, the arguments apply without much

modification to more general model, which contains N -component Bose field $X = X^1; \dots; X^N$ with $N \geq 1$, but otherwise is described by the same action (1) and the "spherical brane" boundary condition (2). Therefore throughout this appendix we mostly address this N -component spherical brane model. Presence of arbitrary number of components allows for a number of checks within the $1=N$ expansion.

7.2 Integrals of motion

In the bulk, the spherical brane model is a free Bose field, and as such it certainly has infinite number of integrals of motion. The derivative ∂X , where $\partial = \partial_i$ stands for the derivative over $u = \sigma + i\tau$, is a holomorphic field in the bulk. Hence any local polynomial $P(u) = P(\partial X; \partial^2 X; \dots)$ of this and higher derivatives with respect to u gives rise to a local integral of motion

$$I[P] = \int \frac{d}{2} P(\partial X; \partial^2 X; \dots); \quad (53)$$

where we have assumed the coordinate along the cylinder to be the Euclidean time. Here and below the bulk composite fields entering these polynomials are always understood in terms of the normal ordering with respect to the standard Wick pairing $\langle X^a(u; u) X^b(u^0; u^0) \rangle = \delta^{ab} \log |u - u^0|$ corresponding to a bulk free field in an infinite space. Certainly, there is a "left-moving" counterpart to each of the integrals (53),

$$I[P] = \int \frac{d}{2} P(\partial X; \partial^2 X; \dots); \quad (54)$$

where $\partial = \partial_i$. The integrals (53), (54) are operators acting in the space of states of free N -component massless Bose field quantized on a spatial circle of the circumference $2\pi R$, i.e.

$$H = \sum_P F_P^\dagger F_P; \quad (55)$$

where F_P is the Fock space of the right-moving bosons with the zero-mode momentum P . Large set of integrals (53) contains many infinite subsets $I[P_s]$ (corresponding to special sequences of the polynomials P_s) of mutually commutative operators,

$$I[P_s]; I[P_{s^0}] = 0; \quad (56)$$

The polynomial fields P_s can always be chosen to have definite spin, and it is convenient to label them accordingly; below we always assume that s indicates the spin of $P_s(u)$. We will also use conventional notation I_{s-1} for the integral $\int P_s$.

As is discussed in [37], integrability of the field theory (1) in the presence of the boundary requires that the boundary state satisfies the equations

$$(I_s - I_s) jB_i = 0 ; \quad (57)$$

for all I_s in one such subset. These equations must follow from special properties of the boundary conditions, which should be such that the corresponding fields $P_s(u)$ and $P_s(u)$, being brought to the boundary $= 0$, satisfy the conditions

$$P_s(u) - P_s(u) = 0 = i \frac{d}{d} s() ; \quad (58)$$

where $s()$ are some (renormalized) local boundary fields. In the case of the spherical brane boundary condition (2), existence of the first few polynomials satisfying (58) can be demonstrated by an argument similar to that previously used to support integrability of the $O(N)$ sigma model [15]. The $O(N)$ symmetry of the boundary condition (2) suggests that the polynomials P_s must have this symmetry as well. We thus can look for the corresponding integrals I_{s-1} in the form :

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \int \frac{d}{2} \partial X \partial X ; \\ I_3 &= \int \frac{d}{2} \partial X \partial X^2 + b_3 \partial^2 X \partial X^i ; \\ I_5 &= \int \frac{d}{2} \partial X \partial X^3 + b_5 \partial^2 X \partial X \partial X \\ &\quad + c_5 \partial^2 X \partial X^2 + d_5 \partial^3 X \partial X^i ; \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

and for generic k

$$\begin{aligned} I_{2k-1} &= \int \frac{d}{2} \partial X \partial X^k + b_{2k-1} \partial^2 X \partial X \partial X^{k-2} \\ &\quad + c_{2k-1} \partial^2 X \partial X^2 \partial X \partial X^{k-3} + \dots ; \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

Note that in writing these expressions we have fixed the normalization of the currents P_{2k} : the term $\partial X \partial X^k$, having the highest power of X , comes

with the coefficient 1. In what follows we always assume this normalization of the integrals I_{2k-1} . The terms omitted in (60) have powers of X equal $2k-4$ or lower. In general case, the difference $P_s(u) - P_s(u)|_{=0}$ is a combination of local boundary fields having appropriate symmetries. These include the $O(N)$ symmetry and the anti-symmetry with respect to the reflection $!$. Note that for $N=2$ the last reflection symmetry is violated unless $=0$ and $=$. Also, only the fields of right scale dimensions (i.e. equal or below the scale dimension of P_s) are admitted. Elementary counting shows that for $s=2$ the only admissible field is a total derivative over $,$ of the form of the r.h.s. of (58). For $s=4$ there is only one admissible field which is not a total derivative, and for $s=6$ there are three admissible non-derivative fields. It follows that P_2 always satisfy (58), and the coefficients in (59) can be adjusted to ensure that P_4 and P_6 satisfy (58) as well. The role of the boundary condition (2) in this counting is in reducing the number of independent boundary fields: the boundary conditions determine the number of redundant boundary fields. As usual, this kind of argumentation fails for higher spins, since the number of admissible fields grows too fast. Nonetheless, in many other models similar "low-spin test" was successful in detecting full integrability, with no known (to us) exceptions. Therefore we regard the above argument as a strong indication of integrability of the spherical brane model.

In fact, the coefficients in (59) for P_4 and P_6 can be determined explicitly from the commutativity condition (56). While I_1 automatically commutes with any $IP]$ of the form (53), the condition $[I_3; I_5] = 0$ turns out to be rather rigid. As it turns, it has only one solution (for the coefficients $b; c; d$ in (59)) with suitable properties⁴, namely

$$\begin{aligned} b_3 &= (N+2)=3; \\ b_5 &= 3(N+4)=5; \\ c_5 &= 7(N+4)=5; \\ d_5 &= (N+4)(36N+59)=600 : \end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

At large N the integrals I_3 and I_5 reduce to their quadratic in X terms, in

⁴ In fact, there are exactly three solutions. The other two correspond to previously known systems of commuting integrals. One represents the trivial free-field case, where all integrals I_{2k-1} are quadratic in X (obviously, normalization assumed in (59) has to be changed to accommodate this case); such integrals can be compatible only with the free field boundary conditions (i.e. no nonlinear constraints on $X_B(,)$, and possibly a term $\int d^2 X_B(,)$ added to the action (10)). Another solution corresponds to the "KdV series", in which the currents $P_s(u)$ are composite fields built from the energy-momentum tensor $T(u) = \partial X \partial X$, as was described in [22].

agreement with easily established fact that in the $N \rightarrow 1$ limit the spherical brane model becomes a free theory [38]. Moreover, we have checked that with this choice the integrals (60) indeed satisfy (57) in the first nontrivial order of the $1/N$ expansion.

It looks likely that ones I_3 is fixed through Eqs.(59),(61), the higher-spin integrals I_{2k+1} with $k = 3;4;5:::$ are determined uniquely by the commutativity condition $[I_s; I_3] = 0$. Although for higher spins the brute-force computation of the commutators becomes difficult, it is possible to determine this way the coefficients explicitly written in (60):

$$\begin{aligned} b_{2k+1} &= \frac{k(k-1)(2k+N-2)}{2(2k-1)}; \\ c_{2k+1} &= \frac{k(k-1)(k-2)(2k+1)(2k+N-2)}{6(2k-1)}; \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

7.3 Boundary state

In view of the structure (55) of the space H , it is convenient to think of the boundary state in terms of associated boundary operator. Natural isomorphism between F_P and F_P (the right movers are replaced by the left movers) makes it possible to establish one to one correspondence between the states in $F_P = F_P$ and operators in F_P . Thus the boundary state $|B\rangle$ can be re-interpreted as an operator $B : F_P \rightarrow F_P$. This idea was extensively used in the study of conformal boundary conditions since the original works [39,40]. In this interpretation the equation (58) reduces to the statement of commutativity,

$$[B; I_s] = 0 : \quad (63)$$

The boundary state therefore can be written as

$$|B\rangle = \sum_P \sum_n B_n(P) |j_n; P\rangle \overline{|j_n; P\rangle}; \quad (64)$$

where $|j_n; P\rangle$ are the (orthonormalized) simultaneous eigenvectors of the operators I_s in the space F_P , and $B_n(P)$ are corresponding eigenvalues of B ,

$$B |j_n; P\rangle = B_n(P) |j_n; P\rangle; \quad (65)$$

The eigenvalue $B_0(P)$ corresponding to the Fock vacuum $|j_0; P\rangle$ in F_P coincides with the overlap $\langle h_0 | j_P \rangle$. This structure of $|B\rangle$ emphasizes importance

of the problem of simultaneous diagonalization of the integrals of motion I_s . Similar problem was addressed in [22] for somewhat simpler model of integrable boundary interaction (the minimal CFT perturbed by the boundary field $\phi_{1,3}$). In that case associated system of integrals I_s was the KdV series (see footnote # 4). It was observed in [22] that the eigenvalues of I_s are related to corresponding eigenvalues of B in the following way. When the length of the boundary $2R \rightarrow 1$, the operator $\log B$ admits asymptotic expansion in terms of the local integrals I_s ⁵. We expect similar relation to hold in the case of the spherical brane model, namely

$$B \sim B_{\text{IR}} \exp \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} C_k (2E)^{1-2k} I_{2k-1} ; \quad (66)$$

where B_{IR} is the boundary operator associated with the infrared fixed point, E is the energy scale (14), I_{2k-1} with $k \geq 1$ are the integrals (59), (60), $I_1 = \frac{d}{2} = R$, and the coefficients C_k are just numbers, independent of the parameters g_0 , R , and P . The expansion (66) is expected to hold in the sense of asymptotic $R \rightarrow 1$ series (note that $I_{2k-1} \sim R^{1-2k}$ by dimensional counting). The dependence of the matrix elements (66) on R and P comes through the integrals I_{2k-1} . For instance, for the vacuum-vacuum matrix element

$$I_{2k-1} = \langle 0; P | I_{2k-1} | 0; P \rangle \quad (67)$$

we have, from Eqs.(59-62)

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \frac{1}{R} h^2 + \frac{N}{24} ; \\ I_3 &= \frac{1}{R^3} h^4 + \frac{N+2}{12} h^2 + \frac{N(N+2)}{320} ; \\ I_5 &= \frac{1}{R^5} h^6 + \frac{N+4}{8} h^4 + \frac{(N+4)(37N+78)}{4800} h^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{N(N+4)(143N+282)}{483840} ; \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

⁵ This structure appears in integrable boundary flows down to the "basic" conformal boundary, the one which admits no primary boundary fields but the identity. In those cases the expansion in I_s corresponds to expansion of the infrared effective action in terms of descendants of the identity. Clearly, the Dirichlet boundary $X_B = 0$ is of that kind. For integrable boundary flows down to "elevated" fixed points, which admit nontrivial boundary primaries, the asymptotic expansions of B at large R should contain "dual" nonlocal integrals of motion [41] as well. This is what we would expect to have in the case of $\phi = 0$ of the circular brane.

and for general k

$$I_{2k-1} = \frac{1}{R^{2k-1}} h^{2k} + \frac{k(2k+N-2)}{24} h^{2k-2} + \dots; \quad (69)$$

where $h^2 = \frac{E^2}{4}$. In the limit when $R \rightarrow 1$ with $H = \frac{h}{2R}$ kept fixed, these eigenvalues become simply $I_{2k-1} \rightarrow R(2H)^{2k}$, and therefore C_k in (66) are just the coefficients of the power series expansion of the boundary energy $E(H)$ in (13),

$$E(H) = E \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} C_k \left(\frac{H}{E}\right)^{2k}; \quad (70)$$

At the moment we have only a conjecture about exact form of these coefficients in the spherical brane model,

$$C_k = (-1)^k (2)^{1-k} \frac{((2k-1))}{k! 2^{k-1} (\)} (2k-1)^{(1-2)+-1}; \quad (71)$$

with $\frac{1}{N-1}$ and $k \geq 1$. It is possible to check that this expression agrees with the leading order of $1/N$ expansion in the $O(N)$ spherical brane model. The conjecture (71) concerns with the coefficients C_k with $k \geq 1$, but it does not directly apply to the coefficient C_0 . According to (70), the latter relates to the boundary energy at zero external field H , $E(0) = C_0 E$. Presently, we do not have definite idea what exact value of C_0 is. Simply setting $k=0$ in (71) is not quite acceptable, since doing so results in complex numbers for generic N . On the other hand, it is likely that exact C_0 is closely related to the expression (71) with $k=0$ (its real part $= 2 \cot(\)$). One indication is that (71) with $k=0$ develops a pole at $N=2$, presumably signifying the small-instanton divergence specific to this value of N . Similar pole at $N=3$ is present in the bulk vacuum energy of $O(N)$ sigma model [42].

References

- [1] J.M. Kosterlitz, Phys. Rev. Lett. 37, 1577 (1976).
- [2] W. Hofstadter and W. Zwerger, Phys. Rev. Lett. 78, 3737 (1997).
- [3] R.G. Leigh, Mod. Phys. Lett. A 4, 2767 (1989).
- [4] V.S. Rychkov, JHEP 212, 68 (2002).

- [5] C.G. Callan, C. Lovelace, C.R. Nappi and S.A. Yost, Nucl. Phys. B 293, 83 (1987).
- [6] I. A. Aleshchuk and A. Ludwig, Phys. Rev. Lett. 67, 161 (1991).
- [7] A.M. Polyakov, Phys. Lett. B 59, 79 (1975).
- [8] A.A. Belavin and A.M. Polyakov, Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 22, 503 (1975) [JETP Lett. 22, 245 (1975)].
- [9] S.E. Korshunov, Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Phys. 45, 342 (1987) [JETP Lett. 45, 434 (1987)].
- [10] Y.V. Nazarov, Phys. Rev. Lett. 82, 1245 (1999).
- [11] V.A. Fateev, I.V. Frolov and A.S. Schwarz, Nucl. Phys. B 154, 1 (1979).
- [12] X. Wang and H. Grabert, Phys. Rev. B 53, 12621 (1996).
- [13] M.V. Feigel'man, A. Kamenev, A.I. Larkin and M.A. Skvortsov, Phys. Rev. B 66, 054502 (2002).
- [14] I.S. Beloborodov, A.V. Andreev and A.I. Larkin, preprint cond-mat/0207010.
- [15] A.M. Polyakov, Phys. Lett. B 72, 224 (1977).
- [16] A.B. Zamolodchikov and A.L.B. Zamolodchikov, JETP Lett. 26, 457 (1977); Nucl. Phys. B 133, 525 (1978).
- [17] V.A. Fateev and A.L.B. Zamolodchikov, Phys. Lett. B 271, 91 (1991).
- [18] A.B. Zamolodchikov and A.L.B. Zamolodchikov, Nucl. Phys. B 379, 602 (1992)
- [19] K.A. Matveev, Phys. Rev. B 51, 1743 (1995).
- [20] M. Luscher, Nucl. Phys. B 200 [FS4], 61 (1981).
- [21] P. Dorey and R. Tateo, J. Phys. A 32, L419 (1999).
- [22] V.V. Bazhanov, S.L. Lukyanov and A.B. Zamolodchikov, Comm. Math. Phys. 177, 381 (1996)
- [23] V.V. Bazhanov, S.L. Lukyanov and A.B. Zamolodchikov, Jour. Stat. Phys. 102, 567 (2001).

- [24] V.V. Bazhanov, A.N. Hibberd and S.M. Khoroshkin, Nucl. Phys. B 622, 475 (2002).
- [25] V.V. Bazhanov, S.L. Lukyanov and A.M. Tsvelik, preprint RU-NHETC 2003-12, cond-mat/0305237.
- [26] V.A. Fateev, E. Onofri and A.B. Zamolodchikov, Nucl. Phys. B 406, 521 (1993).
- [27] S.L. Lukyanov, E.S. Vitchev and A.B. Zamolodchikov, preprint RU-NHETC 2003-35, hep-th/0312168.
- [28] C.G. Callan and L. Thorlacius, Nucl. Phys. B 329, 117 (1990).
- [29] A.O. Caldeira and A.J. Leggett, Phys. Rev. Lett. 46, 211 (1981).
- [30] V. Ambegaokar, U. Eckern and G. Schon, Phys. Rev. Lett. 48, 1745 (1982).
- [31] G. Schon and A.D. Zaikin, Phys. Rep. 198, 237 (1990).
- [32] D.V. Averin and K.K. Likharev, in Mesoscopic Phenomena in Solids, eds. B.L. Altshuler et al. (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1991), p.173.
- [33] G. Falci, G. Schon and G.T. Zimanyi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, 3257 (1995).
- [34] I. Aeck, Acta Phys. Polon. B 26, 1869 (1995).
- [35] A.M. Tsvelick and P.B. Wiegmann, Adv. in Phys. 32, 453 (1983).
- [36] N. Andrei, K. Furuya and J.H. Lowenstein, Rev. Mod. Phys. 55, 331 (1983).
- [37] S. Ghoshal and A. Zamolodchikov, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 9, 3841 (1994).
- [38] S.R. Renn, preprint cond-mat/9708194.
- [39] N. Ishibashi, Mod. Phys. Lett. A 4, 251 (1989).
- [40] J.L. Cardy, Nucl. Phys. B 324, 581 (1989).
- [41] V.V. Bazhanov, S.L. Lukyanov and A.B. Zamolodchikov, Comm. Math. Phys. 190, 247 (1997).
- [42] A.B. Zamolodchikov, private communication.