

# Bosonization out of equilibrium

D. B. Gutman<sup>1,2</sup>, Yuval Gefen<sup>3</sup>, and A. D. Mirlin<sup>4,1,2,5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Institut für Theorie der kondensierten Materie, Universität Karlsruhe, 76128 Karlsruhe, Germany*

<sup>2</sup>*DFG Center for Functional Nanostructures, Universität Karlsruhe, 76128 Karlsruhe, Germany*

<sup>3</sup>*Dept. of Condensed Matter Physics, Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot 76100, Israel*

<sup>4</sup>*Institut für Nanotechnologie, Forschungszentrum Karlsruhe, 76021 Karlsruhe, Germany*

<sup>5</sup>*Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute, 188300 St. Petersburg, Russia*

(Dated: September 4, 2021)

We develop a bosonization technique for one-dimensional fermions out of equilibrium. The approach is used to study a quantum wire attached to two electrodes with arbitrary energy distributions. The non-equilibrium electron Green function is expressed in terms of functional determinants of a single-particle “counting” operator with a time-dependent scattering phase. The result reveals an intrinsic relation of dephasing and energy redistribution in Luttinger-liquids to “fractionalization” of electron-hole excitations in the tunneling process and at boundaries with leads.

PACS numbers: 73.23.-b, 73.40.Gk, 73.50.Td

One-dimensional (1D) interacting fermionic systems are described as Luttinger liquids (LL) [1], whose experimental manifestations include carbon nanotubes, semiconductor, metallic and polymer nanowires, as well as quantum Hall edges. While equilibrium LL have been extensively explored, there is currently a growing interest in *non-equilibrium* phenomena on the nanoscale. The major obstacle for a theoretical study of quantum wires out of equilibrium is that bosonization, a technique most suitable for analytic treatment of LL, has been so far restricted to equilibrium situation.

In this work we develop a bosonic theory for interacting 1D fermions under generic non-equilibrium conditions. The configuration we have in mind is shown in Fig.1: electrons with distributions  $n_\eta(\epsilon)$  ( $\eta = R, L$  labels right- and left-movers) are injected into the LL wire from two non-interacting electrodes. A particularly interesting case involves double-step distributions [2]. Our goal is to calculate the electron Green functions (GFs)  $G^\gtrless(\tau)$  measurable in tunneling spectroscopy experiments [3, 4].

Our microscopic description of the problem begins with Keldysh action in terms of fermionic fields  $\psi(t, x)$  [5],

$$\begin{aligned}
 S &= S_0[\psi] + S_{ee}[\psi], \\
 S_0[\psi] &= i \sum_\eta \int_c dt \int dx \psi_\eta^\dagger \partial_\eta \psi_\eta, \\
 S_{ee}[\psi] &= - \sum_\eta \int_c dt \int dx g(x) (\rho_\eta \rho_{-\eta} + \rho_\eta \rho_\eta). \quad (1)
 \end{aligned}$$

Here  $\rho_\eta = \psi_\eta^\dagger \psi_\eta$  are density fields,  $\partial_\eta = \partial_t + \eta v \partial_x$ ,  $v$  is the Fermi velocity,  $g(x)$  is a spatially dependent interaction strength, and  $\eta = \pm 1$  stands for right/left moving electrons. The essence of bosonization is a reformulation of the theory in terms of bosonic (density) fields. The interacting part of the action  $S_{ee}$  is already expressed in terms of density modes  $\rho_\eta$ . The challenge is to bosonize the free part of the action, where information concerning the state of the non-interacting fermionic system is




FIG. 1: Schematic view of a LL conductor connected to leads with two different incoming fermionic distributions. The LL interaction parameter  $K(x)$  is also shown; the dashed line corresponds to its sharp variation at the boundaries.

encoded. The bosonic counterpart of the free part of the action is found by requiring that it reproduces correlation functions of non-equilibrium free Fermi gas [6],

$$S_0 = \sum_\eta (\rho_\eta \Pi_\eta^{a-1} \bar{\rho}_\eta - i \ln Z_\eta[\bar{\chi}_\eta]). \quad (2)$$

Here we have performed a rotation in Keldysh space, decomposing fields into classical and quantum components,  $\rho, \bar{\rho} = (\rho_+ \pm \rho_-)/\sqrt{2}$ , where the indices  $+$  and  $-$  refer to the two branches of the Keldysh contour;  $\Pi_\eta^a$  is the advanced component of polarization operator, and  $Z_\eta[\bar{\chi}_\eta]$  is a partition function of free fermions moving in the field

$$\bar{\chi}_\eta = \Pi_\eta^{a-1} \bar{\rho}_\eta. \quad (3)$$

Expansion of  $Z_\eta[\bar{\chi}_\eta]$  in  $\bar{\chi}_\eta(t, x)$  generates an infinite series,  $i \ln Z_\eta[\bar{\chi}_\eta] = \sum_n (-1)^{n+1} \bar{\chi}_\eta^n \mathcal{S}_{\eta n}/n$ , governed by irreducible fermionic density correlation functions,  $\mathcal{S}_{\eta n}(t_1, x_1; \dots; t_n, x_n) \equiv \langle\langle \rho_{\eta 1} \rho_{\eta 2} \dots \rho_{\eta n} \rangle\rangle$ , representing cumulants of quantum noise [8]. At equilibrium the random phase approximation (RPA) is exact [9],  $\mathcal{S}_{\eta n} = 0$  for  $n > 2$ , and one obtains the Gaussian theory of conventional bosonization. In a generic non-equilibrium situation, the bosonic action contains terms of all orders with no small parameter; the idea to proceed analytically in a controlled manner may seem hopeless. This,

however, is not the case: non-equilibrium bosonization is an efficient framework in which the functional integration can be performed exactly. Two observations are crucial here. First,  $Z_\eta$  depends only on the quantum component  $\bar{\rho}$ , so that the action, Eq.(2), is linear with respect to the classical component  $\rho$  of the density field. Hence the integration with respect to  $\rho$  can be performed exactly, generating an equation that fixes  $\bar{\rho}$ . As a result, the many-body field theory is mapped onto a problem which has a level of complexity of quantum mechanics. Second, all vertex functions  $\mathcal{S}_{\eta n}$  determining  $Z_\eta[\bar{\rho}_\eta]$  are restricted to the mass shell ( $\omega = \eta v q$ ) with respect to all of their arguments. This will render the effective “quantum mechanics” one-dimensional.

We apply this formalism first to free fermions away from equilibrium, and obtain the single-particle GFs  $G_{0,\eta}^<(x,t) = i\langle\psi_\eta^\dagger(0,0)\psi_\eta(x,t)\rangle$ ,  $G_{0,\eta}^>(x,t) = -i\langle\psi_\eta(x,t)\psi_\eta^\dagger(0,0)\rangle$  by means of the bosonic theory. Since  $G_{0,\eta}$  depends on  $\tau = t - \eta x/v$  only, we set  $x = 0$  and  $t = \tau$  in the arguments of  $G_{0,\eta}$ . The fermionic operators are expressed in terms of the bosonic field in the standard way,  $\hat{\psi}_\eta(x) \simeq (\Lambda/2\pi v)^{1/2} e^{\eta ik_F x} e^{i\hat{\phi}_\eta(x)}$ , where  $\hat{\rho}_\eta(x) = \eta\partial_x\hat{\phi}_\eta/2\pi$  and  $\Lambda$  is an ultraviolet cut-off. After integration over the classical component we find that quantum component  $\bar{\rho}$  satisfies a continuity equation

$$\partial_t\bar{\rho}_\eta + \eta v\partial_x\bar{\rho}_\eta = j(t,x) \quad (4)$$

with the source term  $j = \delta(x)[\delta(t-\tau) - \delta(t)]/\sqrt{2}$ . The fermionic GF is obtained as [with  $\bar{\chi}_\eta$  given by Eq.(3)]

$$G_{0,\eta}^{\gtrless}(\tau) = -\frac{1}{2\pi v} \frac{1}{\tau \mp i/\Lambda} Z_\eta[\bar{\chi}_\eta]. \quad (5)$$

The mass-shell nature of  $\mathcal{S}_{\eta n}$  implies that  $Z_\eta[\bar{\chi}_\eta]$  depends only on the world-line integral

$$\delta_\eta(t) = \sqrt{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\tilde{t} \bar{\chi}_\eta(\tilde{t} - t, \eta v \tilde{t}). \quad (6)$$

More specifically, we find [6]

$$Z_\eta[\bar{\chi}_\eta] = \det[1 + (e^{-i\hat{\delta}_\eta} - 1)\hat{n}_\eta] \equiv \Delta_\eta[\delta_\eta(t)]. \quad (7)$$

For the free-fermion problem the phase  $\delta_\eta(t) = \lambda\omega_\tau(t,0)$  where  $\omega_\tau(t,\tilde{t}) = \theta(\tilde{t} - t) - \theta(\tilde{t} - t - \tau)$  is a “window function” and  $\lambda = 2\pi$ . Thus,  $Z_\eta[\bar{\chi}_\eta] = \Delta_{\eta\tau}(2\pi)$ , where  $\Delta_{\eta\tau}(\lambda)$  is the determinant (7) for a rectangular pulse [7].

Since  $\hat{n}_\eta$  is diagonal in energy space, while  $\hat{\delta}_\eta$  is diagonal in time space, they do not commute, making the determinant non-trivial. Determinants of the type (7) have appeared in a theory of counting statistics [8]. Specifically, the generating function of current fluctuations  $\kappa(\lambda) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{in\lambda} p_n$  (where  $p_n$  is the probability of  $n$  electrons being transferred through the system in a given time window  $\tau$ ) has the same structure as  $\Delta_{\eta\tau}(\lambda)$ . Taylor expansion of  $\ln\kappa(\lambda)$  around  $\lambda = 0$  defines cumulants of current fluctuations.




FIG. 2: Analytic  $\Delta_{\eta\tau}(\lambda)$  vs. periodic  $\kappa(\lambda)$  continuation of the functional determinant. The value of  $\Delta_{\eta\tau}$  at  $\lambda = 2\pi$  determines the free-electron GF, while  $\ln\kappa(2\pi) = 0$  in view of charge quantization. As an example, the equilibrium case is shown. *Inset*: contour of integration for the quasiclassical limit, Eq. (8), of  $\Delta_{\eta\tau}(\lambda)$  is deformed, since a singularity of the integrand crosses the real axis at  $\lambda = \pi$ .

According to its definition,  $\kappa(\lambda)$  is  $2\pi$ -periodic, which is a manifestation of charge quantization. Thus,  $\kappa(2\pi) \equiv 1$  is trivial. On the other hand, we have found that the free electron GF is determined by the value of the functional determinant exactly at  $\lambda = 2\pi$ . A resolution of this apparent paradox is as follows: the determinant  $\Delta_{\eta\tau}(\lambda)$  should be understood as an analytic function of  $\lambda$  increasing from 0 to  $2\pi$ . On the other hand,  $\kappa(\lambda)$  is non-analytic at the branching points  $\lambda = \pm\pi, \pm 3\pi, \dots$ . To demonstrate this, it is instructive to consider the equilibrium case (temperature  $T$ ). Then the expansion of  $\ln\Delta_{\eta\tau}(\lambda)$  in  $\lambda$  is restricted to the  $\lambda^2$  term (since RPA is exact). It is easy to check that the  $\lambda = 2\pi$  point on this parabolic dependence correctly reproduces the fermion GF via Eqs. (5), (7). As to the counting statistics  $\ln\kappa(\lambda)$ , it is quadratic only in the interval  $[-\pi, \pi]$  and is periodically continued beyond this interval, see Fig. 2.

The difference in analytical properties of  $\kappa(\lambda)$  and  $\Delta_{\eta\tau}(\lambda)$  becomes especially transparent if one studies the semiclassical (long- $\tau$ ) limit,

$$\ln\Delta_{\eta\tau}[\lambda] = \frac{\tau}{2\pi\hbar} \int d\epsilon \ln[1 + (e^{-i\lambda} - 1)n_\eta(\epsilon)]. \quad (8)$$

For small  $\lambda$  the singularity of the integrand closest to the real axis is located near  $\epsilon = i\pi T$ . As  $\lambda$  increases, the singularity moves towards the real axis, crosses it at  $\lambda = \pi$  and finally approaches  $\epsilon = -i\pi T$  as  $\lambda \rightarrow 2\pi$  (see inset of Fig.2). The integral for  $\ln\kappa(\lambda)$  is taken along the real axis, resulting in non-analyticity at  $\lambda = \pi$  and in zero value at  $\lambda = 2\pi$ . On the other hand, the contour for  $\ln\Delta_{\eta\tau}(\lambda)$  is deformed to preserve analyticity, resulting in the long- $\tau$  asymptotics  $\ln\Delta_{\eta\tau} = -\tau T \lambda^2/4\pi$ .

The value of  $\lambda = 2\pi$  appearing in the bosonic representation of the free-fermion GF  $G_{0,\eta}(\tau)$  has a clear physical meaning: a fermion is a  $2\pi$ -soliton in the bosonic for-

malism. A natural question to ask is whether values of  $\Delta_{\eta\tau}(\lambda)$  away from  $\lambda = 2\pi$  are physically important. To see that this is indeed the case, consider the Fermi edge singularity (FES) problem. In this problem, an electron excited into the conduction band, leaves behind a localized hole, resulting in an  $s$ -wave scattering phase shift,  $\delta_0$ , of the conducting electrons [10]. In the mesoscopic context, the FES manifests itself in resonant tunneling experiments [11]. The problem is effectively described by chiral 1D electrons interacting with a core hole that is instantly “switched on”. As was shown in [12], taking into account the core hole in the bosonization approach amounts to a replacement of  $e^{i\hat{\phi}}$  by  $e^{i(1-\delta_0/\pi)\hat{\phi}}$  in the boson representation of the fermionic operator. Within our non-equilibrium formalism, this implies a replacement  $j \rightarrow (1 - \delta_0/\pi)j$  in Eq. (4). Performing the derivation as in the free-fermion case, we thus obtain the non-equilibrium FES GF for electrons with an arbitrary distribution  $n(\epsilon)$ ,

$$G^{\gtrless}(\tau) = \mp i\Lambda\Delta_{\tau}[2(\pi - \delta_0)]/2\pi v(1 \pm i\Lambda\tau)^{(1-\delta_0/\pi)^2}. \quad (9)$$

It is easy to check that at equilibrium this reproduces known results [10, 12]. For a non-equilibrium double-step distribution the FES problem was studied in [13] within a complementary (fermionic) approach (separating of  $G(\tau)$  into a product of open line and closed loop contributions) bearing an analogy with functional bosonization [14]. While both approaches yield equivalent results, this equivalence is highly non-trivial [6]. Functional determinants of the type  $\Delta_{\tau}(\lambda)$  can be efficiently evaluated numerically [15].

We are now prepared to address the problem formulated in the beginning of the paper: an interacting quantum wire out of equilibrium, Fig.1. We consider  $G_R^{\gtrless}(\tau)$  for the tunneling point ( $x = 0$ ) located inside the interacting part; generalization to tunneling into a non-interacting region is straightforward. Integrating over the classical components  $\rho_{\eta}$  as explained above, we obtain equations satisfied by the quantum components  $\bar{\rho}_{\eta}$  of the density fields,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \bar{\rho}_R + \partial_x \left[ \left( v + \frac{g}{2\pi} \right) \bar{\rho}_R + \frac{g}{2\pi} \bar{\rho}_L \right] &= j \\ \partial_t \bar{\rho}_L - \partial_x \left[ \left( v + \frac{g}{2\pi} \right) \bar{\rho}_L + \frac{g}{2\pi} \bar{\rho}_R \right] &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

The solution of Eq. (10) determines the phases  $\delta_{\eta}(t)$  according to Eqs. (6), (3), which can be cast in the form

$$\delta_{\eta}(t) = -2\pi\sqrt{2}\eta \lim_{\tilde{t} \rightarrow -\infty} \int_0^{\eta v(\tilde{t}+t)} d\tilde{x} \bar{\rho}_{\eta}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{t}). \quad (11)$$

Remarkably, Eq. (11) expresses the phase  $\delta_{\eta}(t)$  affected by the electron-electron interaction, through the asymptotic behavior of  $\bar{\rho}(x, t)$  in the non-interacting parts of the wire (regions I and III in Fig.1). The phases  $\delta_{\eta}(t)$




FIG. 3: Phases  $\delta_{\eta}(t)$  entering Eq. (12) for the GFs for sharp [a),b);  $r = (1 - K)/(1 + K)$ ] and adiabatic [c),d)] boundaries.

determine the GFs via

$$G_R^{\gtrless}(\tau) = -\frac{\Delta_R[\delta_R(t)]\Delta_L[\delta_L(t)]}{2\pi v(\pm i\Lambda)^{\gamma}(\tau \mp i/\Lambda)^{1+\gamma}}, \quad (12)$$

where  $\gamma = (1 - K)^2/2K$  and  $K = (1 + g/\pi v)^{-1/2}$  is the standard LL parameter in the interacting region.

To explicitly evaluate  $\delta_{\eta}(t)$  for the structure of Fig. 1, it is convenient to rewrite Eqs. (10) as a second-order differential equation for the current  $\bar{J} = v(\bar{\rho}_R - \bar{\rho}_L)$ ,

$$(\omega^2 + \partial_x u^2(x)\partial_x)J(\omega, x) = 0, \quad x \neq 0, \quad (13)$$

where  $u(x) = v(1 + g(x)/\pi v)^{1/2}$  is a spatially dependent plasmon velocity. Reflection and transmission of plasmons on both boundaries is characterized by the coefficients  $r_{\eta}, t_{\eta}$  ( $r_{\eta}^2 + t_{\eta}^2 = 1$ ); for simplicity, we assume them to be constant over a characteristic frequency range  $\omega \sim \tau^{-1}$ . Subsequently  $\delta_{\eta}(t)$  is found to be a superposition of rectangular pulses,  $\delta_{\eta}(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \delta_{\eta,n} w_{\tau}(t, t_n)$ , where  $t_n = (n + 1/2 - 1/2K)L/u$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\eta,2m} &= \pi t_{\eta} r_L^m r_R^m (1 + \eta K)/\sqrt{K}, \\ \delta_{\eta,2m+1} &= -\pi t_{\eta} r_{\eta}^m r_{-\eta}^{m+1} (1 - \eta K)/\sqrt{K}. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

The phases  $\delta_{\eta}(t)$  are shown in Fig. 3 for two limits of adiabatic ( $r_{\eta} = 0$ ) and sharp [ $r_{\eta} = (1 - K)/(1 + K)$ ] boundaries.

In physical terms,  $\delta_{\eta}(t)$  characterizes phase fluctuations in the leads that arrive at the time interval  $[0, \tau]$  at the measurement point  $x = 0$ , governing the dephasing and the energy distribution of electrons encoded in the GFs  $G_{\eta}^{\gtrless}(\tau)$ . Up to inversion of time, one can think of  $\delta_{\eta}(t)$  as describing the fractionalization of a phase pulse

(electron-hole pair) injected into the wire at point  $x$  during the time interval  $[0, \tau]$ . This is closely related to the physics of charge fractionalization discussed earlier [16, 17]. At the first step, the pulse splits into two with relative amplitudes  $(1 + K)/2$  and  $(1 - K)/2$  carried by plasmons in opposite directions, cf. Ref. [16]. As each of these pulses reaches the corresponding boundary, another fractionalization process takes place: a part of it is transmitted into a lead, while the rest is reflected. The reflected pulse reaches the other boundary, is again fractionalized there, etc. Let us stress an important difference between boundary fractionalization of transmitted charge [17] and that of dipole pulses. While in the former case the boundaries can always be thought as sharp, in the present problem the way  $K(x)$  is turned on is crucially important for reflection coefficients  $r_\eta$  at  $\omega \sim \tau^{-1}$ .

For  $\tau \ll L/u$  the coherence of plasmon scattering may be neglected and the result splits into a product

$$\Delta_\eta[\delta_\eta(t)] \simeq \prod_{n=0}^{\infty} \Delta_{\eta\tau}(\delta_{\eta,n}), \quad (15)$$

with each factor representing a contribution of a single phase pulse  $\delta_{\eta,n}(t) = \delta_{\eta,n} w_\tau(t, 0)$ . For the “partial equilibrium” state (when  $n_R(t)$  and  $n_L(t)$  are of Fermi-Dirac form but with different temperatures) the functional determinants are gaussian functions of phases, reproducing earlier results of functional bosonization [4].

We now apply our general result (15) to the “full non-equilibrium” case, when  $n_\eta(\epsilon)$  have a double step form,  $n_\eta(\epsilon) = a_\eta \theta(V_\eta - \epsilon) + (1 - a_\eta) \theta(-\epsilon)$ . The split zero-bias-anomaly dips are then broadened by non-equilibrium dephasing rate,  $1/\tau_\phi^\eta$  [2, 4]. The latter can be found from the long-time asymptotics of  $G_\eta(\tau)$ , employing Eq. (8). We obtain  $1/\tau_\phi^R = 1/\tau_\phi^{RR} + 1/\tau_\phi^{RL}$ , where  $1/\tau_\phi^{\eta\eta'}$  is the contribution to dephasing of  $\eta$  fermions governed by the distribution of  $\eta'$  fermions. Focussing on the adiabatic limit, we find these dephasing rates to be

$$1/\tau_\phi^{R\eta} = -\frac{eV_\eta}{2\pi} \ln \left( 1 - 4a_\eta(1 - a_\eta) \sin^2 \frac{\pi(1 + \eta K)}{2\sqrt{K}} \right), \quad (16)$$

see Fig. 4. Two remarkable features of this result should be pointed out. First, for certain values of the interaction parameter  $K$  (different for  $\eta = R, L$ ) the dephasing rates  $1/\tau_\phi^{R\eta}$  vanish. Second, consider the weak-interaction regime,  $\gamma \ll 1$ . We then obtain  $1/\tau_\phi^{RL} \simeq \pi\gamma eV_L a_L(1 - a_L)$  and  $1/\tau_\phi^{RR} \simeq \pi(\gamma^2/8)eV_R a_R(1 - a_R)$ . This should be contrasted with RPA which predicts equal  $1/\tau_\phi^{RL}$  and  $1/\tau_\phi^{RR}$  [2]. While  $1/\tau_\phi^{RL}$  agrees with the RPA result,  $1/\tau_\phi^{RR}$  is parametrically smaller (suppressed by an extra factor of  $\gamma$ ). The reason for this failure of RPA is clear from our analysis. For a weak interaction the contributions of R and L movers to  $G_R$  are given by the functional determinants  $\Delta_{\eta\tau}(\delta_\eta)$  with phases (for an adiabatic barrier)  $\delta_L \simeq (1 - K)\pi$  and  $\delta_R \simeq \pi(1 + K)$ . While




FIG. 4: Dephasing rates  $\tau_\phi^{RR}$  and  $\tau_\phi^{RL}$  as function of LL parameter  $K$  for the adiabatic case and double step distributions with  $a_R = a_L = 1/3$ .

the contribution of the small phase  $\delta_L$  is captured correctly by RPA, a small- $\delta$  expansion of  $\ln \Delta_{R\tau}(\delta_R)$  fails for large  $\delta_R$  (apart from equilibrium and “partial equilibrium” where  $\ln \Delta_{\eta\tau}(\delta) \propto \delta^2$ .)

To conclude, we have developed a non-equilibrium bosonization technique and used it to find GFs for tunneling spectroscopy of a LL conductor. Our solution is presented in terms of functional determinants of single particle operators. It elucidates the relation between the charge fractionalization on one hand, and energy redistribution and non-equilibrium dephasing on the other hand. We have calculated dephasing broadening of the ZBA dips for double-step distributions. Our approach has various further applications, including spinful electrons, interferometry, noise, and many-body entanglement [6].

We thank D. Abanin, D. Bagrets, L. Glazman, L. Levitov, P. Ostrovsky, and Y. Nazarov for discussions. This work was supported by GIF, Einstein Minerva Center, US-Israel BSF, ISF, Minerva Foundation, and DFG SPP 1285.

- 
- [1] M. Stone, *Bosonization* (World Scientific, 1994); A.O. Gogolin, A.A. Nersisyan, and A.M. Tsvelik, *Bosonization in Strongly Correlated Systems*, (University Press, Cambridge 1998); T. Giamarchi, *Quantum Physics in One Dimension*, (Claverdon Press Oxford, 2004).
  - [2] D.B. Gutman, Y. Gefen, and A.D. Mirlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 126802 (2008).
  - [3] Y.F. Chen *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 036804 (2009).
  - [4] D.B. Gutman, Y. Gefen, and A.D. Mirlin, arXiv:0903.3333.
  - [5] For structure in the Keldysh space see, e.g., A. Kamenev and A. Levchenko, Adv. Phys. **58**, 197 (2009).
  - [6] Technical details and extensions will appear elsewhere [D.B.Gutman, Y.Gefen, and A.D.Mirlin, in preparation].
  - [7] We normalize the determinants  $\Delta_{\eta\tau}(\lambda)$  to their equilibrium, zero-temperature value.
  - [8] L.S. Levitov, H. Lee, and G.B. Lesovik, J. Math. Phys. **37**, 4845 (1996).
  - [9] I. E. Dzyaloshinskii and A. I. Larkin, Sov. Phys. JETP **38**, 202 (1973).
  - [10] P. Nozières and C. T. De Dominicis, Phys. Rev. **178**, 1097 (1969).

- [11] K.A. Matveev and A.I. Larkin, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 15337 (1992); A.K. Geim *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 2061 (1994).
- [12] K.D. Schotte and U. Schotte, Phys. Rev. **182**, 479 (1969).
- [13] D.A. Abanin and L.S. Levitov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 186803 (2005).
- [14] A. Grishin, I.V. Yurkevich, and I.V. Lerner, Phys. Rev. B **69**, 165108 (2004) and references therein.
- [15] I. Snyman and Y.V. Nazarov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 096802 (2007); I. Nadar and F. Marquardt, New Journal of Physics **9**, 112 (2007).
- [16] K. Le Hur, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 076801 (2005); H. Steinberg *et al.*, Nature Physics **4**, 116 (2008).
- [17] D.L. Maslov and M. Stone, Phys. Rev. B **52**, R5539 (1995); I. Safi and H.J. Schulz, *ibid.* **52**, R17040 (1995).