

# Slow Dynamics in a Two-Dimensional Anderson–Hubbard Model

Yevgeny Bar Lev and David R. Reichman

*Department of Chemistry, Columbia University, 3000 Broadway, New York, New York 10027, USA*

We study the real-time dynamics of a two-dimensional Anderson–Hubbard model using nonequilibrium self-consistent perturbation theory within the second-Born approximation. When compared with exact diagonalization performed on small clusters, we demonstrate that for strong disorder this technique approaches the exact result on all available timescales, while for intermediate disorder, in the vicinity of the many-body localization transition, it produces quantitatively accurate results up to nontrivial times. Our method allows for the treatment of system sizes inaccessible by any numerically exact method and for the complete elimination of finite size effects for the times considered. We show that for a sufficiently strong disorder the system becomes nonergodic, while for intermediate disorder strengths and for all accessible time scales transport in the system is strictly subdiffusive. We argue that these results are incompatible with a simple percolation picture, but are consistent with the heuristic random resistor network model where subdiffusion may be observed for long times until a crossover to diffusion occurs. The prediction of slow finite-time dynamics in a two-dimensional interacting and disordered system can be directly verified in future cold atoms experiments.

Ergodicity plays a central role in the statistical mechanics of closed systems. While it is usually difficult to rigorously prove that a given system is ergodic, our everyday experience strongly suggests that generic interacting systems with many-degrees of freedom *are* ergodic. The underlying assumption is that inelastic collisions between particles allow for redistribution of energy and relaxation to equilibrium. This is precisely the reason why it was commonly believed that Anderson localization [1], a truly nonergodic phenomenon, will be destroyed by the addition of a the smallest local inelastic interactions [2]. It therefore came as a surprise when two groups argued that a truly nonergodic phase, later dubbed the many-body localized phase, generically exists at a *finite* energy density and *finite* interaction strengths [3, 4]. By tuning the parameters of the system a dynamical many-body localization transition between ergodic and nonergodic phases occurs. This transition was first observed numerically [5, 6], and more recently in cold-atoms experiment [7].

While the existence of a stable nonergodic phase at finite energy density is the hallmark of many-body localization, transport, or the absence of thereof, in this phase is not very interesting. On the other hand, it was recently demonstrated that transport within the ergodic phase, previously believed to be diffusive [3, 4], exhibits subdiffusion for nontrivial times in *one-dimensional* systems [8–10]. A heuristic theoretical explanation of the subdiffusive behavior suggests that transport in the system is similar to the random resistor problem [11, 12], where rare and large insulating regions have a dominant effect in one-dimension [10]. Subdiffusion also naturally arises in the phenomenological renormalization group (RG) treatments of the same problem, where close to the MBL transition blocking (or thermal) regions appear on every length scale (RG step) [13, 14]. The fractal structure of the blocking (or thermal) regions has led to the proposal

that the many-body localization transition is a sort of a percolation transition [14–16]. Similar suggestions were previously made for the metal–insulator transition in two dimensional systems at zero temperature [17].

One of the predictions within the percolation picture is that the observed subdiffusive behavior in the ergodic phase in one-dimensional systems will be absent in *higher dimensions*, where blocking systems can be avoided [14–16, 18]. This prediction is asymptotic in its nature, and any generalization to finite times will depend on the chosen model. One of the main problems in studying subdiffusion is that most numerically exact methods struggle within the ergodic phase. This is in contrast to the case of the nonergodic MBL phase, where many numerically exact methods are available and efficient (see [19, 20] and references within),. One exception is the study of dc conductivity at low temperatures using determinantal quantum Monte-Carlo (DQMC), where it was possible to circumvent the need for analytic continuation and compute dc conductivity directly in real time. This allowed for the study of the metal–insulator transition as a function of the interaction strength for a two-dimensional model [21–23]. It is not clear, however, if this approach carries over to high temperatures, of interest to MBL. Moreover, it provides only asymptotic (dc) information.

In this work, we examine the dynamics of a two-dimensional Anderson–Hubbard model using nonequilibrium perturbation theory within the second-Born approximation. While our approach is approximate, we show that it quantitatively reproduces exact results in small systems for a wide range of parameters and appears to become exact for the timescales of investigation in the limit of strong disorder. This approach is similar to the diagrammatic approach of Ref. [4], which first established the many-body localization transition. We relax several of the approximations of Ref. [4] and compute in detail the dynamics of the system from an appropriately

chosen initial condition.

We investigate a two-dimensional Anderson–Hubbard model,

$$H = -t \sum_{\langle \mathbf{r}\mathbf{r}' \rangle, \sigma} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{r}\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\mathbf{r}'\sigma} + U \sum_{\mathbf{r}} \hat{n}_{\mathbf{r}\uparrow} \hat{n}_{\mathbf{r}\downarrow} + \sum_{\mathbf{r}, \sigma} h_{\mathbf{r}\sigma} \hat{n}_{\mathbf{r}\sigma} \quad (1)$$

where  $\hat{c}_{\mathbf{r}\sigma}^\dagger$  creates a fermion of spin  $\sigma = \pm 1/2$  at site  $\mathbf{r}$ ,  $\hat{n}_{\mathbf{r}\sigma}$  is the density operator,  $t$  is the hopping matrix element (we set  $t = 1$  throughout),  $U$  is the interaction strength and  $h_{i\sigma}$  are random fields independently distributed on the interval  $h_{i\sigma} \in [-W, W]$ . To eliminate all symmetries of this Hamiltonian we subject the fermionic species to *different* disorder fields. Since the model has a finite number of states per site the energy density is bounded, which allows for meaningful consideration of the infinite temperature limit. Note that while for systems with unbounded energy density the infinite temperature limit normally coincides with the classical limit, this is not necessarily the case for systems with bounded energy density. For example in the *noninteracting* Anderson model in one and two dimensions, all the eigenstates are localized and therefore localization persists at *any* temperature. In this limit the many-body localization transition occurs as a function of the parameters of the system, and not the temperature [5]. In what follows we will consider only the infinite temperature limit, and use the strength of the disorder as a control parameter of the many-body localization transition (we fix the interaction to be  $U = 0.5$ ). The theoretical boundary of the MBL transition at half-filling and infinite temperature may be estimated as (Eq. (93) of Ref. [24]),

$$U_c = 0.174 \frac{\nu}{K \ln K} \quad K = 4\Delta\nu\xi^2, \quad (2)$$

where  $\nu$ ,  $\Delta$  and  $\xi$  are the one-particle density of states, bandwidth and localization length, correspondingly. Taking the appropriate values for the one-particle problem, the boundary line of the MBL transition can be readily calculated (see Fig. 1). Since we are interested in studying the dynamics across the transition, we vary the disorder strength in the interval  $5 \leq W \leq 20$  (yielding a *non-interacting* localization length  $\xi < 5.5$ ).

To study the dynamics we use the equations of motion for the one-particle nonequilibrium correlators,

$$\begin{aligned} G_{ij}^>(t; t') &= -i \text{Tr} \left\{ \hat{\rho}_0 \hat{c}_i(t) \hat{c}_j^\dagger(t') \right\}, \\ G_{ij}^<(t; t') &= i \text{Tr} \left\{ \hat{\rho}_0 \hat{c}_j^\dagger(t') \hat{c}_i(t) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where  $\hat{\rho}_0$  is the initial density matrix. For an *uncorrelated* initial density matrix, the Green's functions obey




Figure 1: (color online) Dynamical phase boundaries of the two-dimensional disordered Hubbard model at infinite temperature as a function of  $W$  and  $U$ . The phase boundary was obtained using Eq. (93) of Ref. [24] and demarcates ergodic and nonergodic regions. The white circles correspond to the parameters used in this work  $W = 5 - 20$  and  $U = 0.5$ .

the Kadanoff–Baym equations of motion [25],

$$\begin{aligned} i\partial_t G^{\gtrless}(t, t') &= \left( \hat{h}_0 + \Sigma^{HF}(t) \right) G^{\gtrless}(t, t') \\ &+ \int_0^t \Sigma^R(t, t_2) G^{\gtrless}(t_2, t') dt_2 \\ &+ \int_0^{t'} \Sigma^{\gtrless}(t, t_2) G^A(t_2, t') dt_2, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where spatial indices and summations are suppressed for clarity;  $\hat{h}_0$  is the one particle Hamiltonian;  $\Sigma^{HF}(t)$ ,  $\Sigma^{\gtrless}(t)$  are the Hartree-Fock greater and lesser self-energies of the problem respectively; and the superscripts 'R' and 'A' represent retarded and advanced Green's functions and self-energies, which are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma^R(t, t_2) &= \theta(t - t_2) (\Sigma^>(t, t_2) - \Sigma^<(t, t_2)) \\ G^A(t_2, t') &= -\theta(t' - t_2) (G^>(t_2, t') - G^<(t_2, t')). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

We note in passing that this equation is *exact* if the exact self energies are employed. Since normally this is not possible, approximate forms for the self energies are used. Here we use the second-Born approximation for the self-energy,

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{ij}^{HF}(t) &= -iU\delta_{ij}G_{ii}^<(t; t) \\ \Sigma_{ij}^>(t, t') &= U^2 G_{ji}^<(t', t) G_{ij}^>(t, t') G_{ij}^>(t, t') \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

which is a self-consistent conserving approximation, specifically it conserves the total energy and number of particles and amounts to a resummation of an infinite class of diagrams. This approximation was originally considered in the pioneering work of Ref. [4], but due to the complexity of (4), it was reduced to a corresponding quantum Boltzmann equation. It is numerically feasible

to solve (4), within full second-Born approximation, however this is known to generate spurious relaxation [26]. This problem can be avoided via the the introduction of the generalized Kadanoff-Baym ansatz for the greater (lesser) correlator,

$$G^{\lessgtr}(t, t') = i \left[ G^R(t, t') G^{\lessgtr}(t', t') - G^{\lessgtr}(t, t) G^A(t, t') \right], \quad (7)$$

and by approximating the retarded and advanced Green's functions with their Hartree-Fock (HF) values [27–29]. Substituting Eqs. (7) and (6) into (4) one obtains the Quantum Master Equation (QME) for the one-particle density matrix. Unlike the Boltzmann equation used in Ref. [4], this approach considers the full one-particle density matrix and not just its diagonal values, and therefore includes additional quantum information. We refer the reader to Refs. [27, 28] for additional discussion.

In the infinite temperature limit, the equilibrium density matrix  $\rho_0$  in (3) is proportional to the unity matrix, and it is tempting to use this maximally mixed state as an initial condition. However as alluded to in Ref. [4] and we explained in our previous work [8], this choice would lead to erroneous results, in particular in the limit of infinite disorder. To alleviate this issue we use pure and uncorrelated initial conditions. Specifically, we fix the number of fermions for each species (we use half-filling throughout this work) and distribute all fermions randomly on a square lattice. For these initial conditions it is straightforward to show that our approach becomes *exact* in the zero hopping limit. Moreover, as we demonstrate below, even for finite hopping and large disorder our method quantitatively approaches the exact behavior exhibited by finite sized systems studied with exact diagonalization. The infinite temperature limit is achieved by averaging the observables over random realizations of the initial conditions. To study the dynamics of the system we calculate the density-density correlation function at infinite temperature,

$$C(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'; t) = \frac{1}{2Z} \sum_{\alpha\sigma} \left\langle \alpha \left| \left( \hat{n}_{\mathbf{r}\sigma}(t) - \frac{1}{2} \right) \left( \hat{n}_{\mathbf{r}'\sigma}(0) - \frac{1}{2} \right) \right| \alpha \right\rangle, \quad (8)$$

where  $|\alpha\rangle$  states are the random initial states described above and  $Z$  is the total number of many-body states. Normally this quantity requires *two*-particle correlators, however our initial conditions have the useful property,  $\langle \hat{n}_{\mathbf{r}\sigma}(t) \hat{n}_{\mathbf{r}'\sigma}(0) \rangle = \langle \hat{n}_{\mathbf{r}\sigma}(t) \rangle n_{\mathbf{r}'\sigma}(0)$ , where  $n_{\mathbf{r}'\sigma}(0) = 0, 1$  is the occupation number of the initial state and,

$$\langle \hat{n}_{\mathbf{r}\sigma}(t) \rangle = -iG_{\sigma}^<(\mathbf{r}t, \mathbf{r}t). \quad (9)$$

To study the relaxation of the system we calculate the autocorrelation of the density and the mean-square displacement,

$$\rho(t) = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{\mathbf{r}} \overline{C(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}; t)}, \quad r^2(t) = \sum_{\mathbf{r}} \overline{r^2 C(\mathbf{r}, 0; t)}. \quad (10)$$




Figure 2: (color online) Comparison between exact diagonalization (black) and nonequilibrium self-consistent perturbation theory (red/gray) for several disorder strengths ( $W = 1, 5$  and  $7$ ) performed on a small Hubbard cluster of dimensions  $3 \times 3$ . The left panel shows the density-density correlation function as a function of time, and the right shows the average mean-square displacement, computed using Eq. (10). An average over 1000 disorder realizations was performed and shaded areas designate uncertainty bounds.

For a diffusive system we have,  $\rho(t) \sim t^{-d/2}$ , and  $r^2(t) \sim t$ , while for localized systems both  $\rho(t)$  and  $r^2(t)$  are expected to saturate at infinite times to finite quantities. Similar quantities based on the one-time density  $[n_{\mathbf{r}}(t)]$  were studied for the clean systems out-of-equilibrium [30–32], however, such quantities cannot be directly used in equilibrium where any one-time operator is independent of time.

The quantum master equation (QME) is solved numerically for the one-particle correlators as a function of time within the self-consistent second-Born approximation. For this purpose we utilize the parallel numerical scheme developed in Ref. [33]. After obtaining the one-particle correlators, we extract the density-density correlation function (8) and average it over both the initial conditions and disorder realizations. Depending on the strength of the disorder, we use between 35 realizations for the weakest disorder strengths and 400 realization for the strongest disorder strengths. The perturbation theory reproduces the exact (and trivial) result for zero hopping. To evaluate its performance for nonzero hopping we compare the perturbative calculation to the exact diagonalization (ED) solution of a small Hubbard cluster of size  $3 \times 3$ . As seen from Fig. 2 a remarkable correspondence between the QME and the exact solutions is seen for  $U = 0.5$  and times  $t \lesssim 40$ . This correspondence does *not* exist at the HF level (not shown). While this comparison has little bearing on the dynamics of MBL in the thermodynamic limit we will assume that this correspondence does *not* become worse for larger systems sizes.

The nature of the transport is assessed by examining

the finite time dynamical exponent,

$$\alpha(t) \equiv \frac{d \ln r^2(t)}{d \ln t}, \quad (11)$$

which has values  $\alpha(t \rightarrow \infty) = 2$  for ballistic transport and  $\alpha(t \rightarrow \infty) = 1$  for diffusive transport. This exponent is directly related to the dynamical exponent,  $z = 2/\alpha$ , which is commonly used in the context of phase transitions and defines the scaling between time and space,  $t \propto L^z$ . For finite systems, asymptotic time dynamics will be dictated by finite size effects such as reflections from the boundaries and the asymptotic value of  $\alpha(t \rightarrow \infty)$  will have little meaning. Nevertheless, due to the locality of the interaction it takes a finite time,  $t_*$ , for a local perturbation to reach the boundary of the system [34]. Therefore for times  $t < t_*$  finite-size effects can be effectively eliminated. In this work we have chosen  $t_* = 50$ , which is sufficient to remove finite size effects for the chosen parameters and sizes studied. Such calculations required about 300,000 computer hours. For the lowest disorder strength we investigated systems of size  $24 \times 24$  were required while for the slowest dynamics (strongest disorder strength) systems of the size  $16 \times 16$  were sufficient. The reader is referred to our previous works for a more detailed explanation of this procedure [8, 9]. We note in passing that the required system sizes lie far above the accessible sizes of any *exact* numerical method. Our method is *approximate*, however Fig. 2 suggests that for the studied disorder strengths and considered times it is essentially *quantitatively exact*. While the chosen time scale of  $t_* = 50$  is definitely not asymptotic, as we will show below it allows access to nontrivial dynamics across the MBL transition. Moreover this is the relevant time-scale for current experiments in cold-atoms, where finite size effects from the harmonic trap, particle loss and decoherence set-in on longer time scales [7, 35].

To evaluate the dynamical exponent as a function of time [see (11)], we divided the data into equal time intervals (on a logarithmic scale) and performed piecewise linear fitting. This is a well defined procedure, which produces a *time-dependent* dynamical exponent, and is *different* from numerical extrapolation performed using power-law fitting. Both procedures however have little bearing on asymptotic transport. The result is demonstrated for several disorder values in the left panel of Fig. 3. For localized systems the value of the dynamical exponent as a function of time,  $\alpha(t)$ , should decay to zero, while for diffusive systems it should asymptotically saturate to  $\alpha(t \rightarrow \infty) = 1$ . As clearly seen from Fig. 3 neither occurs for the studied system, instead the dynamical exponent saturates to a *finite* value on the studied timescale. We repeat this analysis for various disorder strengths and show that the dynamical exponent converges to a finite plateau value for all cases under investigation in the right panel of Fig. 3. This fig-




Figure 3: (color online) Dynamical exponent across the many-body localization transition. On the left panel the dynamical exponent is determined as a function of time for different disorder strengths. Darker shades designate stronger disorder. The right panel shows the dynamical exponent as a function of the disorder strength. Darker shades represent longer times, and the arrows illustrate the convergence of the dynamical exponent in time.

ure summarizes the main result of our work: for non-trivial times the dynamical exponent is *finite* across the many-body localization transition and deep in the ergodic phase. This means that for experimentally relevant times and a broad range of parameters the system exhibits subdiffusive transport. While the transition to diffusion can and may occur at later times (unaccessible to us), as happens in the case of classical supercooled liquids [36], we do not observe this crossover in our study even for the lowest disorder strength [ $W = 5$ ]. Studying even lower disorder strengths is problematic due to the exponential dependence of the *non-interacting* localization length on the disorder strength in two-dimensional systems,  $\xi \propto \exp[A/W^2]$  [37]. From our data it is difficult to pinpoint the location of the MBL transition since  $\alpha(t)$  is never exactly zero. Nevertheless for  $W = 15 - 20$ , the values of the dynamical exponent we obtain are zero within the error bounds, which is consistent with the theoretical estimate presented in Fig. 1. We emphasize that our results do *not* contradict the expectation that the MBL dynamics within the ergodic phase of one-dimensional systems is *qualitatively* distinct from that in higher dimensions, however the duration of apparent subdiffusion we observe is surprising.

Note that our results are rather different from dynamics close to the noninteracting Anderson transition [38]. In this case, close to the transition, the system exhibits apparent subdiffusion with a *constant* dynamical exponent  $\alpha = 2/d$ , for lengths of the order of the correlation (localization) lengths and then crosses-over to either diffusion ( $\alpha = 2$ ) or localization ( $\alpha = 0$ ). This hints that the MBL transition is inherently different from the Anderson transition. It is also interesting to understand

how our results compare to the heuristic percolation picture [13–16]. For classical percolation, the dynamics of the system at the percolation threshold is subdiffusive on all time scales with the universal dynamical exponent [ $\alpha \approx 0.69$ , for  $d = 2$ ]. Above the percolation threshold  $\alpha(t)$  monotonically increases until it reaches one (normal diffusion), and below the percolation threshold  $\alpha(t)$  monotonically decreases to zero [39]. Our results therefore can only correspond to the *nonergodic* phase below the percolation threshold. This renders a literal mapping of the MBL transition to a classical percolation transition as suggested in Refs. [15, 16] inconsistent with the theory of Refs. [4, 8, 24], which places the  $W = 5$  point deep within the ergodic phase (see Fig. 1). On the other hand the random-resistor network picture [10] can be consistent with our results. Within this picture for a sparse distribution of the resistors, an initial monotonic decrease of  $\alpha(t)$  can display long plateaus and an eventual crossover to diffusion [40]. While we have *not* observed this crossover even for the lowest studied disorder, we *do* observe long plateaus of  $\alpha(t)$  which can signal a precursor of this behavior.

In summary we have studied the nonequilibrium dynamics of a two-dimensional Anderson–Hubbard model. For this purpose we have utilized self-consistent nonequilibrium perturbation theory. Our method allows for the study of large system sizes and the elimination of finite size effects up to nontrivial times. While our method is approximate, it appears to become exact in the limit of strong disorder and gives quantitatively reliable results even for intermediate disorder strengths when compared to exact diagonalization studies on small systems. We present evidence consistent with the existence of the many-body localized phase at a two-dimensional system at infinite temperature, and put an upper bound on the location of the many-body localization for a particular interaction strength. Surprisingly, up to the studied times we find subdiffusive dynamics for all the studied parameters. We compare our results to the predictions of the available heuristic theories and point out that while they can be explained within the random-resistor network picture they are inconsistent with the literal adoption of classical percolation theory for the MBL transition. Our results predict that experiments performed on cold atoms in two-dimensional disordered systems will observe a finite regime of subdiffusive transport for times shorter than the typical decoherence time in these experiments.

We would like to thank G. Cohen for many enlightening and helpful discussions. This work was supported by grant NSF-CHE-1644802.

---

[1] P. W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. **109**, 1492 (1958).

[2] L. Fleishman, D. C. Licciardello, and P. W. Anderson,

Phys. Rev. Lett. **40**, 1340 (1978).

- [3] I. Gornyi, A. Mirlin, and D. Polyakov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 206603 (2005).
- [4] D. Basko, I. L. Aleiner, and B. L. Altshuler, Ann. Phys. (N. Y). **321**, 1126 (2006).
- [5] V. Oganesyan and D. A. Huse, Phys. Rev. B **75**, 155111 (2007).
- [6] A. Pal and D. A. Huse, Phys. Rev. B **82**, 174411 (2010).
- [7] M. Schreiber, S. S. Hodgman, P. Bordia, H. P. Luschen, M. H. Fischer, R. Vosk, E. Altman, U. Schneider, and I. Bloch, Science **349**, 842 (2015).
- [8] Y. Bar Lev and D. R. Reichman, Phys. Rev. B **89**, 220201 (2014).
- [9] Y. Bar Lev, G. Cohen, and D. R. Reichman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 100601 (2015).
- [10] K. Agarwal, S. Gopalakrishnan, M. Knap, M. Müller, and E. Demler, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 160401 (2015).
- [11] S. Alexander, J. Bernasconi, W. R. Schneider, and R. Orbach, Rev. Mod. Phys. **53**, 175 (1981).
- [12] S. Alexander, Phys. Rev. B **23**, 2951 (1981).
- [13] R. Vosk, D. Huse, and E. Altman (2014), arXiv:1412.3117.
- [14] A. C. Potter, R. Vasseur, and S. A. Parameswaran (2015), arXiv:1501.03501.
- [15] A. Chandran and C. R. Laumann (2015), arXiv:1501.01971.
- [16] A. Chandran, C. R. Laumann, and D. Gottesman, in *APS March Meet.* (San Antonio, 2015).
- [17] Y. Meir, in *Phys. A Stat. Mech. its Appl.* (2001), vol. 302, pp. 391–403, 9904361.
- [18] S. Gopalakrishnan, M. Müller, V. Khemani, M. Knap, E. Demler, and D. A. Huse (2015), arXiv:1502.07712.
- [19] E. Altman and R. Vosk, Annu. Rev. Condens. Matter Phys. **6**, 383 (2015).
- [20] R. Nandkishore and D. A. Huse, Annu. Rev. Condens. Matter Phys. **6**, 15 (2015).
- [21] P. J. H. Denteneer, R. T. Scalettar, and N. Trivedi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 4610 (1999).
- [22] M. Enjalran, F. Hebert, G. G. Batrouni, R. T. Scalettar, and S. Zhang, Phys. Rev. B **64**, 13 (2001), 0102172.
- [23] P. B. Chakraborty, P. J. H. Denteneer, and R. T. Scalettar, Phys. Rev. B **75**, 125117 (2007).
- [24] V. Ros, M. Müller, and A. Scardicchio, Nucl. Phys. B **891**, 420 (2015).
- [25] L. P. Kadanoff and G. Baym, *Quantum Statistical Mechanics* (Westview Press, 1994).
- [26] M. P. von Friesen, C. Verdozzi, and C.-O. Almbladh, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 176404 (2009).
- [27] V. Špička, B. Velický, and A. Kalvová, Phys. E Low-dimensional Syst. Nanostructures **29**, 154 (2005).
- [28] V. Špička, B. Velický, and A. Kalvová, Phys. E Low-dimensional Syst. Nanostructures **29**, 196 (2005).
- [29] S. Latini, E. Perfetto, A.-M. Uimonen, R. van Leeuwen, and G. Stefanucci, Phys. Rev. B **89**, 075306 (2014).
- [30] K. Fabricius and B. M. McCoy, Phys. Rev. B **57**, 8340 (1998).
- [31] S. Langer, F. Heidrich-Meisner, J. Gemmer, I. P. McCulloch, and U. Schollwöck, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 214409 (2009).
- [32] C. Karrasch, J. E. Moore, and F. Heidrich-Meisner, Phys. Rev. B **89**, 075139 (2014).
- [33] A. Stan, N. E. Dahlen, and R. van Leeuwen, J. Chem. Phys. **130**, 224101 (2009).
- [34] E. H. Lieb and D. W. Robinson, Commun. Math. Phys.

- 28**, 251 (1972).
- [35] E. Lucioni, L. Tanzi, C. D. D'Errico, M. Moratti, M. Inghuscio, and G. Modugno, *Phys. Rev. E* **87**, 042922 (2013).
- [36] K. Binder and W. Kob, *Glassy Materials and Disordered Solids: An Introduction to Their Statistical Mechanics* (World Scientific Publishing Company, 2005).
- [37] A. MacKinnon and B. Kramer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **47**, 1546 (1981).
- [38] T. Ohtsuki and T. Kawarabayashi, *J. Phys. Soc. Japan* **66**, 314 (1997).
- [39] M. Saxton, *Biophys. J.* **66**, 394 (1994).
- [40] C. Khripkov, A. Vardi, and D. Cohen, *New J. Phys.* **17**, 023071 (2015).