

# Kun Chen on effective field theory of Fermi liquid

Jinyuan Wu

April 16, 2022

## 1 UV-complete effective field theory of Fermi liquid

Fermi liquid theory, despite being introduced in all decent condensed matter physics textbooks, is kind of confusing for every beginner. A root cause is there are actually several independent formulation of Fermi liquid theory. The original theory is about the energy functional of eigenstates. Polchinski and Shankar defined a non-UV-complete theory with path integral formulation [5], and it completely ignored the details inside the Fermi sea. Under this framework, we have several possible low-energy interaction channels (or effective vortices)

$$k_1, k_2 \xrightarrow{\Gamma_4} k_1 - q, k_2 + q$$

all of which are near the Fermi surface, including

- (non-)Fermi liquid, where the forward scattering channel ( $q \rightarrow 0$ ) is the most important;
- superconductivity, where the Cooper pair channel ( $k_1 + k_2 \rightarrow 0$ ) is the dominant;
- CDW or SDW order, where the  $q \rightarrow q_c$  channel is the most important. Note that these orders already call for a UV-complete theory, because strictly speaking, only forward scattering and

These orders are separate in the phase diagram, but we know they are all emergent from the condensed matter field theory, and thus it's tempting to find a *grand unification theory* of Fermi-liquid-like field theories, which is still a Fermi-liquid-like EFT of the complete Coulomb interacting electron gas but has more to say about the Fermi sea, because the Cooper pair channel is a high-energy channel for a Fermi liquid, and vice versa, so a theory taking into account all possible Fermi liquid phases involves energy scales higher than the usual energy scale around the Fermi surface and therefore has to account for how the *deep* Fermi sea is disrupted.

Compared to a free electron gas, charged Fermi liquid undergoes significant correction in

- renormalization of the two-point correlation, including  $m^*$  and  $Z < 1$ , and
- renormalization of the four-particle vortex and introduction of Landau parameters.

TODO: why there appears expressions like  $v_q + f_0^+$ , which means the Landau parameters are channels independent to Coulomb interaction? Reference: PRB 20.550 1979, Kukkonen-Overhauser interaction; K. Haule & K. Chen, Sci Rep 12, 2292, 2002

For how to define Landau parameters, see [4]

For Coulomb screening as a stable RG fixed-point, see [3] The fixed point is a point where the Coulomb interaction is “perfectly” screened, while the  $r_s > r_{s, \text{fixed}}$  region is the over-screened region and  $r_s < r_{s, \text{fixed}}$  is the under-screened region. It can be verified that Li, Na, K and Cs are close to the perfectly screened point, which explains why GW or RPA methods fail for them – these methods are too close to under-screened limit, while in Li, Na, K and Cs the Coulomb interaction is almost completely screened. No stable metal known exists in the over-screened region, where electrons attract each other. [1] showed that electrons are still stable in this case, but this may not be the case for ions. Further molecular dynamics research is required to check whether this is the case.

Renormalized perturbation theory beyond the tree level, very similar to techniques used when dealing with QED, can be used to find perturbation around the Fermi-liquid state.

## 2 Superconductivity without phonons

There are already several superconductivity mechanisms without phonons. In Kohn-Luttinger mechanism [2], singularity of polarization at  $q = 2k_F$  induces an attractive effective interaction, so with sufficiently low temperature, it seems all pure charged Fermi liquid falls into superconductivity state. In dynamic screening mechanism [6],

Anderson pseudopotentials: superconductivity in real materials, which can also be explained by the theory here?

## 3 Discrete Lehmann representation

**Discrete Lehmann representation** is a numerical technique proposed in [3]. A generic Lehmann representation is in the form of

$$G(i\omega_n) = \int d\omega \frac{1}{i\omega_n + \omega} \rho(\omega), \quad (1)$$

and if we just take a few peaks into account, we have

$$G(i\omega_n) = \sum_k \frac{1}{i\omega_n + \omega_k} g_k. \quad (2)$$

After inverse Fourier transformation, we have

$$G(\tau) = \sum_k \underbrace{\frac{e^{-\omega_k \tau}}{1 + e^{-\beta \omega_k}}}_{=: K(\omega_k, \tau)} g_k. \quad (3)$$

Comparing this with the original

$$G(\tau) = \int d\omega \rho(\omega) K(\omega, \tau), \quad (4)$$

we find that in principle, (3) as an ansatz is a good approximation of the Green function, even though it involves much fewer frequencies.

## 4 NumericalEFT.jl

## References

- [1] O. V. Dolgov, D. A. Kirzhnits, and E. G. Maksimov. On an admissible sign of the static dielectric function of matter. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 53:81–93, Jan 1981.
- [2] W. Kohn and J. M. Luttinger. New mechanism for superconductivity. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 15:524–526, Sep 1965.
- [3] Carl A. Kukkonen and Kun Chen. Quantitative electron-electron interaction using local field factors from quantum monte carlo calculations. *Phys. Rev. B*, 104:195142, Nov 2021.
- [4] Saverio Moroni, David M. Ceperley, and Gaetano Senatore. Static response and local field factor of the electron gas. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 75:689–692, Jul 1995.
- [5] Joseph Polchinski. Effective field theory and the fermi surface, 1992.
- [6] H. Rietschel and L. J. Sham. Role of electron coulomb interaction in superconductivity. *Phys. Rev. B*, 28:5100–5108, Nov 1983.