

An equation of state for expanded metals

W. Schirmacher¹, W.-C. Pilgrim² and F. Hensel²

¹*Institut für Physik, Johannes-Gutenberg-Universität Mainz, Staudinger Weg 9, D-55099 Mainz, Germany;* ²*Fachbereich 15, Chemie, Physikalische Chemie, Fachbereich Chemie, Philipps-Universität Marburg, Hans-Meerwein-Strasse 4 D-35032 Marburg, Germany.*

We present a model equation of states for expanded metals, which contains a pressure term due to a screened-Coulomb potential with a screening parameter reflecting the Mott-Anderson metal-to-nonmetal transition. As anticipated almost 80 years ago by Zel'dovich and Landau, this term gives rise to a second coexistence line in the phase diagram, indicating a phase separation between a metallic and a nonmetallic liquid.

PACS numbers:

I. INTRODUCTION

For almost 80 years the relation of the metal-nonmetal and liquid-vapor transition of expanded metals is not understood [1–5], despite several efforts in the last decades [4, 6].

In their original paper [1] Zel'dovich and Landau (ZL) present arguments that in expanded metals, in particular mercury, in addition to the usual liquid vapor coexistence line, a second coexistence line (with a second critical point) exists in the (p, T) (pressure-temperature) phase diagram, which involves a phase separation between a metallic and nonmetallic liquid.

Experiments in expanded mercury [4, 5, 7–9] and, more recently in expanded rubidium [10] revealed a density regime, in which there is evidence for an emulsion of a metallic and a nonmetallic phase, thus confirming the ideas of ZL.

The arguments of ZL had been based on the assumption that at zero temperature a discontinuous metal-nonmetal transition takes place, which continues to be present at elevated temperatures.

At these times the only known mechanism for a crossover from a metal to a dielectric was the de-overlapping of bands. ZL argued that a continuous band-de-overlapping transition cannot take place, because in the insulating state an excited electron across the gap interacts via the Coulomb interaction with the hole left behind and thus enhances the gap, when, in the absence of the interaction it would go continuously towards zero.

The role of the electronic Coulomb and exchange interaction on the Metal-nonmetal transition has been addressed extensively by Mott (Mott transition) [11–14]. He realized that these combined interactions produce two separate bands of electrons with opposite spins, giving rise to antiferromagnetic ordering in the insulating state. This scenario, which can be described by the Hubbard model [15], was called Mott transition. Mott believed that the metal-nonmetal transition was discontinuous and postulated the existence of a minimal metallic conductivity. These ideas have been quantified by Yonezawa and Ogawa [2] for calculations of the thermodynamic properties of expanded metals based on the Hubbard model and the coherent-potential approximation. In these calculations an unstable density regime due to the metal-nonmetal transition was identified.

Anderson [16] showed that disorder can be another

reason for a metal-nonmetal transition. This was first demonstrated for non-interacting electrons (Anderson transition). It was then shown [17] that the Anderson transition is an interference phenomenon and could be identified as a second-order (i.e. continuous) phase transition with a non-thermal control parameter, namely the amount of spatial potential fluctuations, seen by an electron. The Anderson scenario, i.e. an electron in a random potential, could be mapped onto the nonlinear sigma model of planar ferromagnets [18–20], which obeys the same scaling as the Anderson transition. In this field theory the density of states at the Fermi level μ was identified as the order parameter, but the critical exponent β turned out to be zero, so that in the “non-ordered state”, the nonmetallic, μ remained finite. That the Anderson transition is continuous was confirmed by experiments on doped semiconductors [21].

The nonlinear-sigma-model description was generalized to include the electronic Coulomb interaction (Mott-Anderson transition) [22–24]. In the presence of the interaction the critical order-parameter exponent β became non-zero, so that μ acquired its usual order-parameter role. A severe drawback of the nonlinear-sigma-model approach is that it is based on treating the variance of the potential fluctuations as small parameter, so the theory is restricted to the weak-disorder limit.

A quite different approach, which does not suffer from this shortcoming, is the dynamical mean-field theory (DMFT) based on the Hubbard model [25–27] and turned out to be a reliable means for treating correlated electronic systems and the Mott transition.

By including disorder into the Hubbard model it proved possible to treat the Mott-Anderson transition by means of the DFMT [28–31]. These developments showed that the *local* single-site density of states μ_i of the disordered interacting electron system exhibits a very broad distribution. As a consequence the arithmetic mean $\langle\mu\rangle$ and the geometric one $\langle\mu\rangle_g$ was shown to become very different in the limit of strong disorder. It was shown, that, in fact $\langle\mu\rangle_g$ is critical at the Anderson-Mott transition, even in the Anderson case, whereas $\langle\mu\rangle$ is not. [28–31].

In the present contribution we shall show that such a continuous Mott-Anderson transition of the electrons produces in an expanded metal an instability in the density regime near the transition, and thus a second phase-separation line between a metallic and nonmetallic liquid phase, as anticipated by ZL.

We argue that in expanded metals the transition scenario for the electrons is a qualitatively different one from that for the metallic atoms/ions. For the electrons the transition is one with increasing spatial disorder in the presence of the electron-electron interaction. This means that for the electrons the disorder is of quenched type. This is so because of the adiabatic principle: On their time scale the electrons experience a snapshot of the atomic arrangements. These arrangements produce increasing spatial potential fluctuations with decreasing density, so that at a critical density the Anderson-Mott transition takes place.

On the other hand, for the atoms/ions the transition scenario is not governed by quenched disorder but by equilibrium thermodynamics. The electronic degrees of freedom provide a density dependent interaction. Using the standard expression for the equation of states for a simple liquid with a potential, which includes a density-dependent screened Coulomb term, we demonstrate that an unstable density interval appears, which, in turn, produces the metal-nonmetal separation in the liquid state. This mechanism of phase separation into a metal-rich and metal-depleted liquid is very similar to that suggested some time ago [32–34] for solutions of metals in molten salts [35, 36].

In II. we introduce our model and present the resulting equation of state. In section III. we show isotherm calculations, which are used to calculate a phase diagram. We conclude with discussing achievements and shortcomings of our approach.

II. MODEL

1. General formalism

We start with the expression for the pressure equation of states [34, 37]

$$P(V, T) = \frac{k_B T}{V} \left(1 - \frac{1}{6} \frac{1}{V k_B T} \int d^3 \mathbf{r} r \phi'(r) g(r) \right) \quad (1)$$

where $g(r)$ is the radial distribution function, T the temperature, k_B is Boltzmann's constant, $V = M/\rho_M$ the atomic volume, ρ_M the mass density, and M the atomic mass.

We now assume that the interatomic potential is composed of three contributions:

- (i) A hard-sphere contribution ϕ_{hs} ;
- (ii) an attractive contribution ϕ_{att} .
- (iii) a screened-Coulomb contribution ϕ_{sc} ;

We now lump the free-gas contribution to the pressure and the hard-sphere potential together to a hard-sphere pressure P_{hs} and write

$$\begin{aligned} P(V, T) &= P_{\text{hs}}(V, T) - \frac{1}{6V^2} \int d^3 \mathbf{r} r [\phi'_{\text{att}}(r) + \phi'_{\text{sc}}(r)] g(r) \\ &= P_{\text{hs}}(V, T) + P_{\text{att}}(V) + P_{\text{sc}}(V) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

For the hard-sphere pressure we use the Van-der-Waals repulsion term ¹

$$P_{\text{hs}}(V, T) = \frac{k_B T}{V - B} \quad (3)$$

with $B \approx d^3$, where d is the distance of nearest approach or effective hard-sphere diameter. B is also of the order of the atomic volume at melting.

Because the radial distribution function is strongly peaked near the nearest-neighbour distance d , and the potential contributions vanish for $r \gg d$ we may replace $\phi'(r)g(r)$ by a delta function and approximately write

$$\frac{1}{V} \int d^3 \mathbf{r} r \phi'_{\text{att};\text{sc}}(r) g(r) \approx Z(V) d \phi'_{\text{att};\text{sc}}(d) \quad (4)$$

with the coordination number

$$Z(V) = \frac{1}{V} \int_{|\mathbf{r}| \leq r_Z} d^3 \mathbf{r} g(r) \quad (5)$$

where r_Z is taken to be at the first minimum of $g(r)$. It has been found experimentally [38] that in some expanded metals Z increases linearly with density

$$Z(V) = Z_0/V \quad (6)$$

with $Z_0 \approx 8V_{\text{M,mp}}$ for both expanded Rb and Cs, where $1/V_{\text{M,mp}}$ is the density at the melting point. So we may write

$$\int d^3 \mathbf{r} r \phi'_{\text{att};\text{sc}}(r) g(r) \approx Z_0 d \phi'_{\text{att};\text{sc}}(d) \quad (7)$$

As generally the minimum of the attractive potential contribution is located at $r_{\text{min}} > d$, $\phi'_{\text{att}}(d) < 0$ and we get a van-der-Waals term

$$P_{\text{att}}(V) = -A \frac{1}{v^2}. \quad (8)$$

with

$$A = \frac{Z_0}{6} r |\phi_{\text{att}}(d)|. \quad (9)$$

Without the screening term the equation of states $p_{\text{hs}}(v) + p_{\text{att}}(v)$ becomes the van-der-Waals equation of states, which gives the usual liquid-vapour transition scenario.

2. Screening length and Metal-nonmetal transition

We now turn to the main object of the present exercise, namely the screened Coulomb potential.

As indicated in the introduction we rely on the adiabatic principle, from which follows that in the situation

¹ See e.g. Ref. [34] for the identification of Van der Waals's $k_B T/(V - A)$ term with the repulsive pressure.

of an expanded metal the (interacting) electrons experience a strongly spatially fluctuating external potential due to the ion cores. These fluctuations are “frozen” on the time scale of the electrons (~ 1 fs). In contrast to this the system of the metallic atoms/ions experience effective pairwise interaction potentials (see below), which are mediated by the electrons with their Mott-Anderson scenario. If the electrons are in the metallic state, they are able to screen the interionic Coulomb interaction. The resulting effective interatomic interaction is subject to equilibrium thermodynamics. So the electrons experience quenched disorder, the atoms/ions experience annealed disorder. The resulting electronic quenched-disorder Mott-Anderson transition is continuous, the thermodynamic one - as we shall see - is discontinuous below the corresponding critical point.

The effective pairwise interaction potential between the ions/atoms in a simple liquid metal can be written as the sum of a direct Coulomb repulsion and an indirect term, which accounts for the screening [39, 40]:

$$\phi(r) = \frac{Q^2}{r} + \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int d\mathbf{q} e^{i\mathbf{q}\mathbf{r}} |v_{ps}(\mathbf{q})|^2 \chi_e(\mathbf{q}) \quad (10)$$

Here $Q = N_e e$ is the ionic charge, e is the elementary charge, N_e is the ionic relative charge (number of electrons per ion or valence), $\chi(\mathbf{q})$ is the electronic susceptibility and $v_{ps}(\mathbf{q})$ the electron-ion (pseudo) potential. $\chi_e(\mathbf{q})$ is the electronic susceptibility, which in the Hartree approximation can be written as

$$\chi_e(\mathbf{q}) = \frac{q^2}{4\pi e^2} \frac{1 - \epsilon(q)}{\epsilon(q)} \quad (11)$$

$\epsilon(q)$ is the Lindhard dielectric function of the free electron gas [41], which can be simplified using the Thomas-Fermi approximation [40, 41]

$$\epsilon(\mathbf{q}) = 1 + \frac{\lambda_{TF}^2}{q^2} \quad (12)$$

with the Thomas-Fermi screening parameter (inverse squared screening length)

$$\lambda_{TF}^2 = 4\pi e^2 \mu_F \quad (13)$$

Here $\mu_F = 4k_F/a_B e^2$ is the free-electron density of states at the Fermi level, $a_B = \hbar^2 m e^2$ the Bohr radius, m the electronic mass and k_F the Fermi wavenumber $k_F = \sqrt[3]{3\pi^2 N_e/V}$.

Using this approximation for $\epsilon(\mathbf{q})$ and the empty-core pseudopotential of Ashcroft [42], which is a Coulomb potential $v_{ps} = -Q/r$ outside of the ionic radius R_c and zero for $r < R_c$, one obtains [40]

$$\phi(r) = c(R_c) \frac{Q^2}{r} e^{-\lambda_{TF} r} \quad (14)$$

where $c(R_c)$ is a prefactor related to R_c [40].

For the potential derivative we obtain

$$r \frac{d}{dr} \phi(r) = -c(R_c) \frac{Q^2}{r} [1 + \lambda(V)r] e^{-\lambda(V)r} \quad (15)$$

As mentioned in the introduction, the density of states can be considered as the order parameter for the Mott-Anderson metal-nonmetal transition, i.e. the transition




FIG. 1: The function $\mu(v)/\mu_f^{(0)}$ of Eq. (17) for smoothing parameters $s = 0.0, 0.01, 0.02, 0.03, 0.04$ from bottom (blue) to top (red).

of *interacting* electrons in the presence of quenched disorder [23, 28–31]. In the typical-medium DMFT treatment of the Mott-Anderson transition the geometrically averaged local density of states μ vanishes linearly with the control parameter, which is the width of the distribution of the fluctuating local potentials, divided by the band width. As the latter is strongly density dependent, we make the following ansatz for the local density of states

$$\mu(V) = \mu_F f(x(V)) \quad (16)$$

with the normalized density $x(V) = \frac{V_{MNM}}{V} - 1$ and

$$f(x) = x\theta(x) \quad (17)$$

where $\theta(x)$ is the step function and V_{MNM} is the critical atomic volume of the metal-nonmetal transition.

So we have

$$\lambda(V) = \lambda_0(V) f^{1/2}[x(V)] \quad (18)$$

with $\lambda_0^2(V) = 4\pi e^2 \mu_F(V)$. As the density, viz. volume dependence of λ_0 is considerably weaker than the critical one we set λ_0 constant, i.e. $\lambda_0(V) = \lambda_0(V_{mp})$. Finally we may write

$$P_{sc}(V) = \frac{C}{V^2} [1 + \lambda(V)d] e^{-\lambda(V)d} \quad (19)$$

with $C = c(R_c)Q^2 Z_0/6d$.

Collecting all the terms contributing to the pressure we obtain our central result

$$P(V, T) = \frac{k_B T}{V - B} - \frac{A}{V^2} + \frac{C}{V^2} [1 + \lambda(V)d] e^{-\lambda(V)d}. \quad (20)$$

Beyond the Anderson-Mott transition ($V > V_{MNM}$) we have

$$P_{sc}(V) = \frac{C}{V^2} \quad (21)$$

so that in this limit we obtain an effective Van-der-Waals equation of states with

$$A_{\text{eff}} = A - C \quad (22)$$




FIG. 2: $p-v$ isotherms according to our equation of states (25) for *zero* smoothing parameter s (thin lines) and $s = 0.02$ (thick lines) for the temperature range $0.2 \leq t \leq 0.3$. Further parameters used are $v_{MNM} = 1.3$ and $\lambda_0 d = 8$. The dashed lines are the equilibrium pressures calculated with the Maxwell and double-tangent construction. Inset: $p-t$ phase diagram. The dots indicate the critical points.

It should be noted that the equation of states (20) interpolates [43] between that of a liquid metal (small v) and a free gas (large v).

3. Inhomogeneities and smoothing of the metal-nonmetal transition

Relation (18) together with (17) describes (at zero temperature) a rather sharp transition between the metallic and nonmetallic state. Such a transition is predicted by the generalized nonlinear sigma model, which is based on weak disorder [22–24]. At elevated temperature one may expect this transition to be somewhat smoothed.

On the other hand, the alternative theory of the Mott-Anderson transition, tailored for the case of strong correlations and strong disorder [28–31], predicts a very broad distribution of local densities of state μ_i . A sharp transition is found for the geometric average $\langle \mu \rangle_g = \exp\{\langle \ln \mu_i \rangle\}$, whereas the arithmetic average $\langle \mu_i \rangle$ is non-critical.

We now phenomenologically introduce a *smoothing of the critical law* [44]. We replace the function $f(x)$ in Eq. (16), which is the antiderivative of the step function $\theta(x)$, by the antiderivative $\tilde{f}(x)$ of the complementary Fermi function $[1 + e^{-x/s}]^{-1}$:

$$\mu(V) = \mu^{(0)} \tilde{f}(x(V)) \quad (23)$$

with

$$\tilde{f}(x) = s \ln [1 + e^{x/s}] \quad (24)$$

where s is the smoothing parameter. For $s \rightarrow 0$ we recover (16).

In Fig 1 we show the influence of s on the critical law. As intended by construction the curves become increasingly smoother with increasing s .




FIG. 3: The pressure (p,t) and density (v^{-1},t) phase diagrams corresponding to the isotherms of Fig. 2. The dots indicate the critical points. ML = metallic liquid, NL = nonmetallic liquid, NV = nonmetallic vapour.

III. RESULTS

We now use dimensionless units $v = V/B$, $t = k_B T B / A_{\text{eff}}$ and $p = P B^2 / A_{\text{eff}}$. In these units the equation of states takes the form

$$p(v,t) = \frac{t}{v-1} - \frac{1+c}{v^2} + \frac{c}{v^2} [1 + \lambda(v)d] e^{-\lambda(v)d}. \quad (25)$$

with $c = C/A_{\text{eff}}$

In these units the critical liquid-vapour quantities are given by

$$t_c^{LV} = \frac{8}{27} \approx 0.3 \quad v_{MNM}^{LV} = 3 \quad p_c^{LV} = \frac{1}{27} \approx 0.037 \quad (26)$$

In Fig. 2 we show the isotherms predicted by the equation of states (25) with the parameters indicated in the caption. These isotherms show two unstable regimes: at high atomic volume the usual liquid-vapour one, at low volume the unstable regime due to the density dependence of the screening, caused by the (continuous!) metal-nonmetal transition. As to be expected, the two-liquid instability occurs in the vicinity of the critical Mott-Anderson volume v_{MNM} .

We have calculated the equilibrium volumes, pressures and temperatures using both the Maxwell construction and the double-tangent method [45]. For the regime above v_{MNM} we used Gibbs' parametric solution of the Van-der-Waals coexistence problem [46]. Below v_{MNM} we implemented a graphical double-tangent construction. In the immediate vicinity of the critical point we used a numerical Maxwell construction, i.e. equating the volumes above and below the coexistence pressure. The resulting phase diagrams are shown in Fig. 2 (dashed lines) and in Fig. 3.

It is remarkable that the smoothing of the electronic metal-nonmetal transition results in a strong reduction of the critical endpoint of the corresponding atomic transition.

Let us now consider the situation in expanded Hg and Rb. We chose our parameter v_{MNM} , which is equal to $3\rho_c/\rho_{MNM}$ to be equal to 1.3, which corresponds to the value of $\rho_{MNM}/\rho_c = 2.3$ in expanded Rb [10]. Pilgrim

et al. [10] have evidence by inelastic neutron scattering that in the density range around $2.3\rho_c$ a micro-emulsion of two liquids is present. Similar evidence has been presented earlier by Ruland and Hensel [9] for expanded Hg in the range around $1.2\rho_c$ by analyzing published small-angle scattering data [7, 8]. This would correspond to $\nu_{MNM} = 2.5$. It has been pointed out in Refs. [9, 10], that the Coulomb interaction between the metallic microdroplets, surrounded by the second-phase nonmetallic material prevents a complete demixing and establishes the micro emulsion.

IV. DISCUSSION

By combining the standard expression for the pressure equation of state of a simple liquid with a hard-core repulsion, a short-range attraction and a screened Coulomb potential reflecting the Mott-Anderson transition via a density-dependent screening length we have constructed an equation of state, which gives rise to a second coexistence line in the phase diagram. As postulated by Zel'dovich and Landau [1] we obtain a separation into a metallic and nonmetallic liquid phase. Contrary to their ideas and the ideas of Mott [11–14], we show that also a *continuous* Mott-Anderson type metal-nonmetal transition of the electrons gives rise to a *discontinuous* liquid-liquid phase separation of the ions/atoms. We have introduced a phenomenologic model for the density dependence of the screening length including the possibility of a smoothed transition. We modeled the smoothing or rounding of this transition [30, 44] by means of the anti-derivative of the Fermi function featuring a smoothing parameter.

We find that the smoothing results in a reduction of the length of the coexistence line. Let us consider again the reasons for such a smoothing to happen. First of all, the electronic transition does not take place at zero temperature but at a temperature approaching the Fermi

temperature. Secondly, for $T = 0$ we assumed the critical exponent of the Mott-Anderson transition to be 1. If it would be larger than one the curve would look like a rounded transition. Thirdly, as mentioned before, the local density of electronic states in the Mott-Anderson scenario as given by the dynamical mean-field theory [28–31] is known to exhibit strong spatial fluctuations, so this as well will effectively lead to a smoothing of the transition. So a more detailed experimental investigation of the liquid-liquid separation line will shed light on the details of the mechanism of the Mott-Anderson transition.

Finally we would like to discuss a point concerning the temperature dependence of our model. Our equation of states (20) has a linear temperature dependence like the van-der-Waals one. By elementary thermodynamic relations one can show that if the second temperature derivative (at constant volume) of the pressure is zero, such is the first volume derivative of the specific heat (at constant temperature). This implies that the specific heat does not depend on the volume. Of course, in a material, in which the electronic degrees of freedom play a dominant role, the linear-temperature term of the specific heat should be present, which is proportional to the density of states at the Fermi level and, hence, should exhibit the same volume dependence as the screening parameter $\lambda(V)^2$. This is not included in our rather crude model. The model has mainly been introduced in order to demonstrate, how a smooth metal-nonmetal transition can lead to a first-order phase transition in an expanded metal and a second coexistence line, as anticipated by Zeldovich and Landau [1]. A more refined version should include a term quadratic in the temperature, which is then related to the specific heat. This term will be a correction of the order of $(k_B T/E_F)^2$, where E_F is the Fermi energy. In a future publication we shall present a more refined version of our equation of states, in which the delta-function approximation of (4) will not be made, and the T^2 term, related to the electronic specific heat, will be included.

-
- [1] L. Landau and J. Zeldovich, *Acta Phys. Chim. USSR* **18**, 194 (1943).
 - [2] F. Yonezawa and T. Ogawa, *Suppl. Progr. Theor. Phys.* **72**, 1 (1982).
 - [3] F. Hensel and H. Uchtmann, *Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem.* **40**, 61 (1989).
 - [4] F. Hensel and W. W. Warren, *Fluid Metals: The Liquid-Vapor Transition of Metal* (Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, 1999).
 - [5] F. Hensel, in *Metal-to-Nonmetal Transitions*, edited by R. Redmer, F. Hensel, and B. Holst (Springer, Berlin, 2010).
 - [6] V. B. Bobrov, S. A. Trigger, and A. G. Zagorodny, *Europhys. Lett.* **101**, 16002 (2013).
 - [7] M. Inui, K. Matsuda, K. Tamura, and D. Ishikawa, *J. Cryst. Soc. Jap.* **48**, 76 (2006).
 - [8] M. Inui, K. Matsuda, D. Ishikawa, K. Tamura, and Y. Ohishi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 185504 (2007).
 - [9] W. Ruland and F. Hensel, *J. Appl. Cryst.* **43**, 244 (2009).
 - [10] W.-C. Pilgrim, D. Szubrin, F. Demmel, A. Orecchini, S. Rols, A. Laloni, and A. D. Francesco, *Europhys. Lett.* **122**, 36005 (2018).
 - [11] N. F. Mott, *Proc. Phys. Soc. London, Ser.* **62**, 416 (1949).
 - [12] N. F. Mott and E. A. Davis, *Electronic Processes in Non-Crystalline Materials* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1971).
 - [13] N. F. Mott, *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A* **382**, 1 (1982).
 - [14] N. F. Mott, *Metal-Insulator Transitions* (Taylor & Francis, London, 1990).
 - [15] J. Hubbard, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond.* **276**, 1365 (1963).
 - [16] P. W. Anderson, *Phys. Rev.* **109**, 1492 (1958).
 - [17] E. Abrahams, P. W. Anderson, C. C. Licciardello, and T. V. Ramakrishnan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **42**, 673 (1979).
 - [18] F. Wegner, *Z. Physik B* **25**, 327 (1976).
 - [19] L. Schäfer and F. Wegner, *Z. Phys. B (Condensed Matter)* **38**, 113 (1980).
 - [20] A. J. McKane and M. Stone, *Ann. Phys. (New York)* **131**, 36 (1981).
 - [21] T. F. Rosenbaum, K. Andres, G. A. Thomas, and R. N. Bhatt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **43**, 1723 (1980).
 - [22] A. M. Finkel'stein, *Sov. Phys. JETP* **57**, 97 (1983).
 - [23] D. Belitz and T. R. Kirkpatrick, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **66**, 261 (1994).

- [24] D. Belitz and T. R. Kirkpatrick, *Z. Phys. B* **98**, 513 (1995).
- [25] W. Metzner and D. Vollhardt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **62**, 324 (1989).
- [26] V. Janiš, *Phys. Rev. B* **40**, 11331 (1989).
- [27] A. Georges and G. Kotliar, *Phys. Rev. B* **45**, 6479 (1992).
- [28] V. Dobrosavljević and G. Kotliar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 3943 (1997).
- [29] K. Byczuk, W. Hofstetter, and D. Vollhardt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 056404 (2005).
- [30] V. Dobrosavljević, in *50 years of Anderson localization*, edited by E. Abrahams (World Scientific, New Jersey, 2010), p. 473.
- [31] K. Byczuk, W. Hofstetter, and D. Vollhardt, in *50 years of Anderson localization*, edited by E. Abrahams (World Scientific, New Jersey, 2010), p. 473.
- [32] C. Holzhey and W. Schirmacher, *J. Physique* **46**, C8 (1985).
- [33] C. Holzhey and W. Schirmacher, *Z. Phys. Chem. (Neue Folge)* **156**, 163 (1988).
- [34] W. Schirmacher, *Theory of liquids and other disordered media* (Lecture Notes in Physics 887, Springer, Heidelberg, 2015).
- [35] M. A. Bredig, in *Molten-salt chemistry*, edited by M. Blander (Wiley Interscience, New York, 1964), p. 367.
- [36] K. Garbade and W. Freyland, *Ber. Bunsenges. Phys. Chem.* **92**, 1131 (1988).
- [37] J.-P. Hansen and I. McDonald, *Theory of simple liquids* (Academic Press, New York, 1986).
- [38] R. Winter, C. Pilgrim, and F. Hensel, *Journal de Physique IV Colloqu* **C5**, 45 (1991).
- [39] R. Evans and W. Schirmacher, *J. Phys. C : Solid State Phys.* **11**, 2437 (1978).
- [40] W. A. Harrison and J. M. Wills, *Phys. Rev. B* **25**, 5007 (1982).
- [41] N. W. Ashcroft and N. D. Mermin, *Solid state physics* (Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Austin, TX, 1976), p. 340.
- [42] N. W. Ashcroft, *Phys. Lett.* **23**, 48 (1966).
- [43] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *Statistical Physics* (Pergamon press, Oxford, 1980), p. 232.
- [44] T. Vojta, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 107202 (2003).
- [45] K. Huang, *Introduction to statistical physics* (Taylor & Francis, London and New York, 2001).
- [46] J. Lekner, *Am. J. Phys.* **50**, 161 (1982).