

Fermi liquids beyond the forward scattering limit: the role of non-forward scatterings for scale invariance and instabilities

Han Ma

*Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics,
Waterloo, Ontario N2L 2Y5, Canada*

Sung-Sik Lee

*Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics,
Waterloo, Ontario N2L 2Y5, Canada and
Department of Physics & Astronomy,
McMaster University, 1280 Main St. W.,
Hamilton, Ontario L8S 4M1, Canada*

Abstract

Landau Fermi liquid theory is a fixed point theory of metals that includes the forward scattering amplitudes as exact marginal couplings. However, the fixed point theory that only includes the strict forward scatterings is non-local in real space. In this paper, we revisit the Fermi liquid theory using the field-theoretic functional renormalization group formalism and show how the scale invariant fixed point emerges as a local theory. The local low-energy effective field theory for Fermi liquids includes not only the forward scatterings but also non-forward scatterings with small but non-zero momentum transfers. In the low-energy limit, the non-forward scattering amplitude takes a scale invariant form if the momentum transfer is scaled along with the energy. If the bare coupling is attractive beyond a critical strength, the coupling function exhibits a run-away flow, signifying potential instabilities in particle-hole channels. What drives those instabilities is the non-trivial renormalization group flow of the non-forward scattering amplitudes. The pairing interaction also obeys a scaling relation if the center of mass momentum of Cooper pairs is comparable with energy.

I. INTRODUCTION

As one of the most prevalent phases of matter, metals and their phase transitions contain rich physics that is central to our understanding of quantum materials. Thus, Landau Fermi liquid theory of metals has been one of the main pillars of modern condensed matter physics[1]. Introduced initially as a phenomenological model, it only keeps the strict forward scattering amplitudes as interactions between quasiparticles. Despite its immediate success as a phenomenological theory, it took more than thirty years to theoretically justify the validity of the theory[2–4]. From the renormalization group point of view, Landau Fermi liquid theory represents a low-energy fixed point. Being a fixed point theory valid strictly at zero energy, it is rightly non-local in real space at any finite length scale. On the other hand, it is desirable to have an effective field theory of Fermi liquids valid below a small but non-zero energy scale. Such an effective field theory must be local at length scales larger than the inverse of the energy scale. It will allow one to use the powerful machinery of local field theory in describing the emergence of Fermi liquids and their instabilities from a mid-infrared energy scale down to the zero-energy limit. The complete understanding of Fermi liquids beyond the zero energy limit is crucial for extracting scaling behaviours of physical observables at finite energies[5–8]. It will also serve as a solid reference point for theories of non-Fermi liquids[9–50]. For a recent progress toward this goal that uses bosonization, see Refs. [51–53].

In this work, we use the field-theoretic functional renormalization group scheme to describe Landau Fermi liquid and its instabilities within the frame work of renormalizable local effective field theory[54]. The key ingredient of our work is the non-forward scatterings. A local effective field theory must include non-forward scatterings because, at any non-zero energy scale, fermions can exchange non-zero momenta while staying close to the Fermi surface within a thin energy shell. Let $\lambda_{\theta_4\theta_3}^{\theta_1\theta_2}$ represent the coupling function that describes the scattering of two low-energy fermions from angles (θ_4, θ_3) to (θ_1, θ_2) (Fig. 1). While Landau Fermi liquid theory only includes the strict forward scattering amplitude ($\lambda_{\theta_1\theta_2}^{\theta_1\theta_2}$), the full coupling function does depend on $\theta_1 - \theta_4$ and $\theta_2 - \theta_3$ non-trivially. At a non-zero energy scale μ , the coupling function changes smoothly but significantly as the differences in angles change by μ/k_F , where k_F is the Fermi momentum. If a UV theory is within the basin of attraction of the Fermi liquid fixed point, the coupling function flows to a scale invariant form in the low-energy limit. The scale invariance becomes manifest once




FIG. 1. At energy scale μ , two fermions within the energy shell of thickness μ can undergo non-forward scatterings by exchanging small but non-zero momentum $\vec{q} \sim \mu$. General scattering processes are captured by coupling functions that depend on four angles. Alternatively, it can be viewed as a function of two angles for the incoming fermions and momentum transfer $\vec{q}$. At low energies, the coupling function acquires a non-trivial dependence on $\vec{q}/\mu$.

the transferred momentum is scaled along with the energy scale.

While the strict forward scattering amplitude is exactly marginal[2], the non-forward scattering amplitude does receive quantum corrections. The non-trivial RG flow of the general quartic coupling function can drive instabilities in particle-hole channels. If the UV theory has a sufficiently strong attractive interaction, the coupling function exhibits a run-away renormalization group (RG) flow to the strong coupling region due to the non-trivial renormalization of the non-forward scatterings. This implies that the general coupling function is a part of the low-energy data that should be kept within the low-energy effective theory with a small but non-zero energy cutoff. Within the local effective field theory, one should also consider general scattering processes in the particle-particle channel by including interactions of Cooper pairs with small but non-zero center of mass momenta. A scaling relation emerges in the general pairing interaction once the center of mass momentum is scaled along with the energy scale.

The rest of the paper is organized in the following way. In Sec. II, we introduce the local effective field theory for Fermi liquids. Sec. III discusses the effect of non-forward scattering in the near forward scattering channels. In Sec. III A, we present the scale invariance coupling function

that emerges at Fermi liquid fixed points. Sec. III B discusses the instability toward symmetry broken states driven by the flow of non-forward scattering amplitudes. The scaling behaviour of the general pairing interaction is discussed in Sec. IV. Finally, Sec. V summarizes the work.

II. LOCAL EFFECTIVE FIELD THEORY

We consider a circular Fermi surface of spinful fermions that are subject to short-range interactions in two space dimensions. The following discussion can be generalized to higher dimensions in a straightforward way. The partition function is written as $Z = \int \mathcal{D}\psi^\dagger \mathcal{D}\psi e^{-S}$ and the action reads

$$\begin{aligned}
S = & \sum_{\sigma=\pm} \int \frac{d\omega d^2\vec{k}}{(2\pi)^3} \psi_\sigma^\dagger(\omega, \vec{k}) (-i\omega + \varepsilon_{\vec{k}}) \psi_\sigma(\omega, \vec{k}) \\
& + \frac{1}{4} \int \frac{d\omega d\Omega d\Omega' d^2\vec{k} d^2\vec{p} d^2\vec{q}}{(2\pi)^9} \sum_{\sigma_{1,2,3,4}=\pm} (\lambda)_{\vec{k}-\frac{\vec{q}}{2}, \sigma_4; \vec{p}+\frac{\vec{q}}{2}, \sigma_3}^{\vec{k}+\frac{\vec{q}}{2}, \sigma_1; \vec{p}-\frac{\vec{q}}{2}, \sigma_2} \\
& \times \psi_{\sigma_1}^\dagger(\Omega + \frac{\omega}{2}, \vec{k} + \frac{\vec{q}}{2}) \psi_{\sigma_2}^\dagger(\Omega' - \frac{\omega}{2}, \vec{p} - \frac{\vec{q}}{2}) \psi_{\sigma_3}(\Omega' + \frac{\omega}{2}, \vec{p} + \frac{\vec{q}}{2}) \psi_{\sigma_4}(\Omega - \frac{\omega}{2}, \vec{k} - \frac{\vec{q}}{2}). \quad (1)
\end{aligned}$$

$\psi_\sigma(\omega, \vec{k})$ denotes the fermionic field of spin σ , momentum $\vec{k}$ and frequency ω . The bare dispersion is written as $\varepsilon_{\vec{k}} = \frac{1}{2m}(k^2 - k_F^2)$, where k_F is the Fermi momentum. λ is the four-fermion coupling, which is a function of momenta of the incoming and outgoing fermions.

At low energies, we focus on fermions that are close to the Fermi surface. In defining the low-energy scaling limit of the theory, it is convenient to use the polar coordinate, where the two-dimensional momentum of fermion is written as $\vec{k} = (k_F + \kappa)(\cos\theta, \sin\theta)$. κ denotes the deviation of $|\vec{k}|$ from k_F , and θ is the polar angle. Accordingly, the fermion field is written as $\psi_{\sigma;\theta}(\omega, \kappa) \equiv \psi_\sigma(\omega, \vec{k})$. Low-energy effective field theories for finite number of low-energy fields are characterized by a small number of coupling constants. In metals, Fermi surfaces support infinitely many gapless modes as the angle around the Fermi surface plays the role of a continuous flavor. Accordingly, the coupling constants are promoted to coupling functions that depend on angles. In the strict zero energy limit, only two channels of interactions are allowed by the momentum conservation. The first is the forward scatterings and the other is the pairing interactions. Those interactions involve pairs of fermions with zero center of mass momentum in the particle-hole and particle-particle channels, respectively. However, the interaction that only includes the strict forward scattering and the BCS interaction is non-local in the real space. At small but non-

zero energies, the locality forces us to include interactions in which fermion pairs have small but non-zero center of mass momenta. This leads to the local low-energy effective action,

$$\begin{aligned}
S = & k_F \int \frac{d\omega d\kappa d\theta}{(2\pi)^3} \sum_{\sigma=\pm} \psi_{\sigma;\theta}^\dagger(\omega, \kappa) (-i\omega + v_F \kappa) \psi_{\sigma;\theta}(\omega, \kappa) \\
& + \frac{k_F^2}{4} \int \frac{d\omega d\Omega d\Omega' d\kappa d\rho d\phi d\theta d\theta'}{(2\pi)^9} \sum_{\sigma_{1,2,3,4}=\pm} (\lambda_0)_{\substack{\theta - \frac{q \sin(\theta-\phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_1; \theta' + \frac{q \sin(\theta'-\phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_2 \\ \theta + \frac{q \sin(\theta-\phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_4; \theta' - \frac{q \sin(\theta'-\phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_3}} \\
& \times \psi_{\sigma_1; \theta - \frac{q \sin(\theta-\phi)}{2k_F}}^\dagger \left[\Omega + \frac{\omega}{2}, \kappa + \frac{q}{2} \cos(\theta - \phi) \right] \psi_{\sigma_2; \theta' + \frac{q \sin(\theta'-\phi)}{2k_F}}^\dagger \left[\Omega' - \frac{\omega}{2}, \rho - \frac{q}{2} \cos(\theta' - \phi) \right] \\
& \times \psi_{\sigma_3; \theta' - \frac{q \sin(\theta'-\phi)}{2k_F}} \left[\Omega' + \frac{\omega}{2}, \rho + \frac{q}{2} \cos(\theta' - \phi) \right] \psi_{\sigma_4; \theta + \frac{q \sin(\theta-\phi)}{2k_F}} \left[\Omega - \frac{\omega}{2}, \kappa - \frac{q}{2} \cos(\theta - \phi) \right] \\
& + \frac{k_F^2}{4} \int \frac{d\omega d\Omega d\Omega' d\kappa d\rho d\Phi dQ d\theta d\theta'}{(2\pi)^9} \sum_{\sigma_{1,2,3,4}=\pm} (\lambda_1)_{\substack{\theta' - \frac{Q \sin(\theta'-\Phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_1; \theta' + \pi + \frac{Q \sin(\theta'-\Phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_2 \\ \theta - \frac{Q \sin(\theta-\Phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_4; \theta + \pi + \frac{Q \sin(\theta-\Phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_3}} \\
& \times \psi_{\sigma_1; \theta' - \frac{Q \sin(\theta'-\Phi)}{2k_F}}^\dagger \left[\Omega' + \frac{\omega}{2}, \rho + \frac{Q}{2} \cos(\theta' - \Phi) \right] \psi_{\sigma_2; \theta' + \pi + \frac{Q \sin(\theta'-\Phi)}{2k_F}}^\dagger \left[-\Omega' + \frac{\omega}{2}, \rho - \frac{Q}{2} \cos(\theta' - \Phi) \right] \\
& \times \psi_{\sigma_3; \theta + \pi + \frac{Q \sin(\theta-\Phi)}{2k_F}} \left[-\Omega + \frac{\omega}{2}, \kappa - \frac{Q}{2} \cos(\theta - \Phi) \right] \psi_{\sigma_4; \theta - \frac{Q \sin(\theta-\Phi)}{2k_F}} \left[\Omega + \frac{\omega}{2}, \kappa + \frac{Q}{2} \cos(\theta - \Phi) \right]. \quad (2)
\end{aligned}$$

Here λ_0 and λ_1 are the local coupling functions that include the forward and BCS scatterings¹. They allow the total momenta of particle-hole and particle-particle pairs, denoted as $\vec{q}$ and $\vec{Q}$ respectively, to be non-zero. In order for the fermions to stay close to the Fermi surface, the magnitudes of $\vec{q}$ and $\vec{Q}$ must be bounded by μ at energy scale μ . However, it is crucial to allow the momentum transfer to be flexible within that range in order to keep the locality of the effective theory. $\vec{q}$ and $\vec{Q}$ are also written in the polar coordinate as $\vec{q} = q(\cos \phi, \sin \phi)$, $\vec{Q} = Q(\cos \Phi, \sin \Phi)$, where these momenta are not measured relative to Fermi momentum unlike the momenta of fermions. The theory is specified by two parameters, k_F , v_F and two coupling functions, λ_0 , λ_1 .

Under the scale transformation,

$$\begin{aligned}
\omega_s &= \omega/s, \quad \Omega_s = \omega/s, \quad \Omega'_s = \omega/s, \\
\kappa_s &= \kappa/s, \quad \rho_s = \rho/s, \quad q_s = q/s, \quad Q_s = Q/s, \\
\psi_{s;\sigma;\theta}(\omega_s, \kappa_s) &= s^2 \psi_{\sigma;\theta}(\omega, \kappa)
\end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

that leaves angles unchanged, the coupling constants (v_F , k_F) and coupling functions (λ_0 , λ_1) are

¹ It is noted that both λ_0 , λ_1 includes the process in which two fermions with almost zero center of mass momentum go through a near forward scattering. However, the phase space for such overlap is a set of measure zero in the low-energy limit.

transformed as

$$\begin{aligned}
k_{s;F} &= k_F/s, \quad v_{s;F} = v_F, \\
(\lambda_{s;0})_{\theta - \frac{q_s \sin(\theta - \phi)}{2k_{s;F}}; \theta' + \frac{q_s \sin(\theta' - \phi)}{2k_{s;F}}} &= s(\lambda_0)_{\theta - \frac{q \sin(\theta - \phi)}{2k_F}; \theta' + \frac{q \sin(\theta' - \phi)}{2k_F}}, \\
(\lambda_{s;1})_{\theta - \frac{Q_s \sin(\theta - \Phi)}{2k_{s;F}}; \theta' + \pi + \frac{Q_s \sin(\theta' - \Phi)}{2k_{s;F}}} &= s(\lambda_1)_{\theta - \frac{Q \sin(\theta - \Phi)}{2k_F}; \theta' + \pi + \frac{Q \sin(\theta' - \Phi)}{2k_F}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

A few comments on the tree-level scaling is in order. First, the four-fermion couplings have scaling dimension -1 . Nonetheless, the low-energy effective field theory must include them because they can give rise to infrared singularity. In metals, the degree of IR singularity that a coupling can create does not necessarily match its scaling dimension because of the scale associated with the Fermi momentum. Consequently, the notion of renormalizable field theory needs to be generalized for metals[54]. Second, k_F has scaling dimension 1 and runs toward infinity in the low-energy ($s \rightarrow 0$) limit. This is because the size of the Fermi surface measured in the unit of the floating energy scale increases as the low-energy limit is taken. Here, k_F plays the role of a metric that controls the ‘proper’ size of Fermi surface². Third, the action has scaling dimension 1 rather than 0 under this scale transformation³. This is an unusual choice in that action is regarded dimensionless in most field theories. However, this is natural for theories with continuously many gapless modes where the manifold that supports gapless modes comes with a momentum scale. The fact that the low-energy effective action has a positive dimension reflects the fact that the number of patches connected by non-forward scattering increases with decreasing energy[56]. At low energies, the magnitude of typical momentum transfer $\vec{q}$ in the non-forward scattering decreases, which makes the number of decoupled patches increases at low energies.

Now, we consider quantum corrections that renormalize the couplings. We first define the couplings in terms of physical observables. k_F does not receive quantum corrections due to the Luttinger’s theorem. v_F and the coupling functions are defined through the two-point and the

² Alternatively, one can adopt a scaling in which the angle is rescaled with a fixed k_F [55].

³ The action that includes higher order interactions also has dimension 1 under the current scale transformation.

However, we don’t include them here as they do not give rise to IR singularities[54].

four-point vertex functions through

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \kappa} \text{Re} \Gamma_{(2)}(k^*) = v_F + F_1, \quad i \frac{\partial}{\partial \omega} \text{Im} \Gamma_{(2)}(k^*) = 1 + F_2, \quad (5)$$

$$(\Gamma_{(4)})_{k_4^*, \sigma_4; k_3^*, \sigma_3}^{k_1^*, \sigma_1; k_2^*, \sigma_2} = (\lambda_0)_{\theta + \frac{q \sin(\theta - \phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_4; \theta' - \frac{q \sin(\theta' - \phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_3}^{\theta - \frac{q \sin(\theta - \phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_1; \theta' + \frac{q \sin(\theta' - \phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_2} + F_3, \quad (6)$$

$$(\Gamma_{(4)})_{p_4^*, \sigma_4; p_3^*, \sigma_3}^{p_1^*, \sigma_1; p_2^*, \sigma_2} = (\lambda_1)_{\theta - \frac{q \sin(\theta - \Phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_4; \theta + \pi + \frac{q \sin(\theta - \Phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_3}^{\theta' - \frac{q \sin(\theta' - \Phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_1; \theta' + \pi + \frac{q \sin(\theta' - \Phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_2} + F_4. \quad (7)$$

Here, $\Gamma_{(2)}$ and $\Gamma_{(4)}$ represent the two-point and four-point vertex functions, respectively. The energy-momentum vectors used to impose the RG condition are chosen to be $k^* = (\mu, k_F \cos \theta, k_F \sin \theta)$, $k_1^* = (3\mu, k_F \cos \theta + \frac{q}{2} \cos \phi, k_F \sin \theta + \frac{q}{2} \sin \phi)$, $k_2^* = (-\mu, k_F \cos \theta' - \frac{q}{2} \cos \phi, k_F \sin \theta' - \frac{q}{2} \sin \phi)$, $k_3^* = (\mu, k_F \cos \theta' + \frac{q}{2} \cos \phi, k_F \sin \theta' + \frac{q}{2} \sin \phi)$, $k_4^* = (\mu, k_F \cos \theta - \frac{q}{2} \cos \phi, k_F \sin \theta - \frac{q}{2} \sin \phi)$, $p_1^* = (3\mu, k_F \cos \theta' + \frac{Q}{2} \cos \Phi, k_F \sin \theta' + \frac{Q}{2} \sin \Phi)$, $p_2^* = (-\mu, -k_F \cos \theta' + \frac{Q}{2} \cos \Phi, -k_F \sin \theta' + \frac{Q}{2} \sin \Phi)$, $p_3^* = (\mu, -k_F \cos \theta + \frac{Q}{2} \cos \Phi, -k_F \sin \theta + \frac{Q}{2} \sin \Phi)$, $p_4^* = (\mu, k_F \cos \theta + \frac{Q}{2} \cos \Phi, k_F \sin \theta + \frac{Q}{2} \sin \Phi)$. The frequencies, which are order of the floating energy scale μ , are chosen such that infrared divergences are cut off by μ in all particle-particle and particle-hole channels. The spatial momenta lie on the Fermi surface when $\vec{q}$ and $\vec{Q}$ vanish. F_i are RG scheme dependent corrections that are regular in the small μ limit. The local counter terms needed to enforce the RG conditions is written as

$$\begin{aligned} S_{CT} = & k_F \int \frac{d\omega d\kappa d\theta}{(2\pi)^3} \sum_{\sigma=\pm} \psi_{\sigma;\theta}^\dagger(\omega, \kappa) (-i\delta_1 \omega + \delta_2 v_F \kappa) \psi_{\sigma;\theta}(\omega, \kappa) \\ & + \frac{k_F^2}{4} \int \frac{d\omega d\Omega d\Omega' d\kappa d\rho d\phi d\theta d\theta'}{(2\pi)^9} \\ & \times \sum_{\sigma_{1,2,3,4}=\pm} (A_0^\lambda)_{\theta + \frac{q \sin(\theta - \phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_4; \theta' - \frac{q \sin(\theta' - \phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_3}^{\theta - \frac{q \sin(\theta - \phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_1; \theta' + \frac{q \sin(\theta' - \phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_2} (\lambda_0)_{\theta + \frac{q \sin(\theta - \phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_4; \theta' - \frac{q \sin(\theta' - \phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_3}^{\theta - \frac{q \sin(\theta - \phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_1; \theta' + \frac{q \sin(\theta' - \phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_2} \\ & \times \psi_{\sigma_1; \theta - \frac{q \sin(\theta - \phi)}{2k_F}}^\dagger [\Omega + \frac{\omega}{2}, \kappa + \frac{q}{2} \cos(\theta - \phi)] \psi_{\sigma_2; \theta' + \frac{q \sin(\theta' - \phi)}{2k_F}}^\dagger [\Omega' - \frac{\omega}{2}, \rho - \frac{q}{2} \cos(\theta' - \phi)] \\ & \times \psi_{\sigma_3; \theta' - \frac{q \sin(\theta' - \phi)}{2k_F}} [\Omega' + \frac{\omega}{2}, \rho + \frac{q}{2} \cos(\theta' - \phi)] \psi_{\sigma_4; \theta + \frac{q \sin(\theta - \phi)}{2k_F}} [\Omega - \frac{\omega}{2}, \kappa - \frac{q}{2} \cos(\theta - \phi)] \\ & + \frac{k_F^2}{4} \int \frac{d\omega d\Omega d\Omega' d\kappa d\rho d\Phi dQ d\theta d\theta'}{(2\pi)^9} \\ & \times \sum_{\sigma_{1,2,3,4}=\pm} (A_1^\lambda)_{\theta - \frac{Q \sin(\theta - \Phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_4; \theta + \pi + \frac{Q \sin(\theta - \Phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_3}^{\theta' - \frac{Q \sin(\theta' - \Phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_1; \theta' + \pi + \frac{Q \sin(\theta' - \Phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_2} (\lambda_1)_{\theta - \frac{Q \sin(\theta - \Phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_4; \theta + \pi + \frac{Q \sin(\theta - \Phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_3}^{\theta' - \frac{Q \sin(\theta' - \Phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_1; \theta' + \pi + \frac{Q \sin(\theta' - \Phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_2} \\ & \times \psi_{\sigma_1; \theta' - \frac{Q \sin(\theta' - \Phi)}{2k_F}}^\dagger [\Omega' + \frac{\omega}{2}, \rho + \frac{Q}{2} \cos(\theta' - \Phi)] \psi_{\sigma_2; \theta' + \pi + \frac{Q \sin(\theta' - \Phi)}{2k_F}}^\dagger [-\Omega' + \frac{\omega}{2}, \rho - \frac{Q}{2} \cos(\theta' - \Phi)] \\ & \times \psi_{\sigma_3; \theta + \pi + \frac{Q \sin(\theta - \Phi)}{2k_F}} [-\Omega + \frac{\omega}{2}, \kappa - \frac{Q}{2} \cos(\theta - \Phi)] \psi_{\sigma_4; \theta - \frac{Q \sin(\theta - \Phi)}{2k_F}} [\Omega + \frac{\omega}{2}, \kappa + \frac{Q}{2} \cos(\theta - \Phi)]. \quad (8) \end{aligned}$$

Because the effective field theory is local, the RG condition can be enforced with local counter terms. The bare action becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
S_B = & k_{F;B} \int \frac{d\omega_B d\kappa d\theta}{(2\pi)^3} \sum_{\sigma=\pm} \psi_{B;\sigma;\theta}^\dagger(\omega_B, \kappa) (-i\omega_B + v_F \kappa) \psi_{B;\sigma;\theta}(\omega_B, \kappa) \\
& + \frac{k_{F;B}^2}{4} \int \frac{d\omega_B d\Omega_B d\Omega'_B d\kappa d\rho d\phi d\theta d\theta'}{(2\pi)^9} \sum_{\sigma_{1,2,3,4}=\pm} (\lambda_{0;B})_{\substack{\theta - \frac{q \sin(\theta-\phi)}{2k_{F;B}}, \sigma_1; \theta' + \frac{q \sin(\theta'-\phi)}{2k_{F;B}}, \sigma_2 \\ \theta + \frac{q \sin(\theta-\phi)}{2k_{F;B}}, \sigma_4; \theta' - \frac{q \sin(\theta'-\phi)}{2k_{F;B}}, \sigma_3}} \\
& \times \psi_{B;\sigma_1;\theta - \frac{q \sin(\theta-\phi)}{2k_{F;B}}}^\dagger [\Omega_B + \frac{\omega_B}{2}, \kappa + \frac{q}{2} \cos(\theta - \phi)] \psi_{B;\sigma_2;\theta' + \frac{q \sin(\theta'-\phi)}{2k_{F;B}}}^\dagger [\Omega'_B - \frac{\omega_B}{2}, \rho - \frac{q}{2} \cos(\theta' - \phi)] \\
& \times \psi_{B;\sigma_3;\theta' - \frac{q \sin(\theta'-\phi)}{2k_{F;B}}} [\Omega'_B + \frac{\omega_B}{2}, \rho + \frac{q}{2} \cos(\theta' - \phi)] \psi_{B;\sigma_4;\theta + \frac{q \sin(\theta-\phi)}{2k_{F;B}}} [\Omega_B - \frac{\omega_B}{2}, \kappa - \frac{q}{2} \cos(\theta - \phi)] \\
& + \frac{k_{F;B}^2}{4} \int \frac{d\omega_B d\Omega_B d\Omega'_B d\kappa d\rho d\Phi dQ d\theta d\theta'}{(2\pi)^9} \sum_{\sigma_{1,2,3,4}=\pm} (\lambda_{1;B})_{\substack{\theta' - \frac{Q \sin(\theta'-\Phi)}{2k_{F;B}}, \sigma_1; \theta' + \pi + \frac{Q \sin(\theta'-\Phi)}{2k_{F;B}}, \sigma_2 \\ \theta - \frac{Q \sin(\theta-\Phi)}{2k_{F;B}}, \sigma_4; \theta + \pi + \frac{Q \sin(\theta-\Phi)}{2k_{F;B}}, \sigma_3}} \\
& \times \psi_{B;\sigma_1;\theta' - \frac{Q \sin(\theta'-\Phi)}{2k_{F;B}}}^\dagger [\Omega'_B + \frac{\omega_B}{2}, \rho + \frac{Q}{2} \cos(\theta' - \Phi)] \psi_{B;\sigma_2;\theta' + \pi + \frac{Q \sin(\theta'-\Phi)}{2k_{F;B}}}^\dagger [-\Omega'_B + \frac{\omega_B}{2}, \rho - \frac{Q}{2} \cos(\theta' - \Phi)] \\
& \times \psi_{B;\sigma_3;\theta + \pi + \frac{Q \sin(\theta-\Phi)}{2k_{F;B}}} [-\Omega_B + \frac{\omega_B}{2}, \kappa - \frac{Q}{2} \cos(\theta - \Phi)] \psi_{B;\sigma_4;\theta - \frac{Q \sin(\theta-\Phi)}{2k_{F;B}}} [\Omega_B + \frac{\omega_B}{2}, \kappa + \frac{Q}{2} \cos(\theta - \Phi)] \quad (9)
\end{aligned}$$

The bare variables are related to the renormalized variables through the multiplicative renormalization factors, $Z_i = 1 + \delta_i$, $(Z_i^\lambda)_{\theta_4, \theta_3}^{\theta_1, \theta_2} = 1 + (A_i^\lambda)_{\theta_4, \theta_3}^{\theta_1, \theta_2}$ for $i = 1, 2$,

$$\omega_B = \frac{Z_1}{Z_2} \omega, \quad \psi_B = \sqrt{\frac{Z_2}{Z_1}} \psi, \quad (\lambda_{i;B})_{\theta_4, \theta_3}^{\theta_1, \theta_2} = \frac{(Z_i^\lambda)_{\theta_4, \theta_3}^{\theta_1, \theta_2} \mu^{-1} (\tilde{\lambda}_i)_{\theta_4, \theta_3}^{\theta_1, \theta_2}}{Z_1 Z_2}, \quad k_{B;F} = \mu \tilde{k}_F. \quad (10)$$

Here, we use the scheme in which v_F is fixed. $(\tilde{\lambda}_i)_{\theta_4, \theta_3}^{\theta_1, \theta_2} = \mu (\lambda_i)_{\theta_4, \theta_3}^{\theta_1, \theta_2}$ and $\tilde{k}_F = \mu^{-1} k_F$ represent dimensionless objects that are measured in the unit of the floating energy scale. The beta functionals for the coupling functions are obtained by keeping $\lambda_{i;B}$ fixed with varying the floating energy. This leads to the beta functionals,

$$\frac{d(\tilde{\lambda}_i)_{\theta_4, \theta_3}^{\theta_1, \theta_2}}{dl} = \left[-1 - 3(z - 1) - 4\eta_\psi + \frac{d \log (Z_i^\lambda)_{\theta_4, \theta_3}^{\theta_1, \theta_2}}{d \log \mu} \right] (\tilde{\lambda}_i)_{\theta_4, \theta_3}^{\theta_1, \theta_2}. \quad (11)$$

Here $l = \log(\Lambda/\mu)$ is the logarithmic length scale with Λ being a UV cutoff. $z = \frac{d \log Z_1/Z_2}{d \log \mu}$ is the dynamical critical exponent and $\eta_\psi = \frac{d \log \sqrt{Z_2/Z_1}}{d \log \mu}$ is the anomalous dimension of the fermion. The dimensionless Fermi momentum obeys $\frac{d \tilde{k}_F}{dl} = \tilde{k}_F$.

At the one-loop order, only the following diagrams contribute to the beta functionals,

$$\Gamma^{(4)} = \text{Diagram 1} + \text{Diagram 2} + \text{Diagram 3}, \quad (12)$$

and $z = 1$ and $\eta_\psi = 0$. The first diagram contributes to the near forward scatterings. The third diagram contributes the pairing interaction. In the following sections, we compute the beta functionals in the two channels for general $\vec{q}$ and $\vec{Q}$.

III. NEARLY FORWARD SCATTERING

At the one-loop order, only the first diagram in Eq. (12) contributes to the quantum correction of the near forward scattering processes. The counter term reads

$$\begin{aligned}
& (A_0^\lambda)_{\theta+\frac{q\sin(\theta-\phi)}{2k_F},\sigma_4;\theta'-\frac{q\sin(\theta'-\phi)}{2k_F},\sigma_3} (\lambda_0)_{\theta-\frac{q\sin(\theta-\phi)}{2k_F},\sigma_1;\theta'+\frac{q\sin(\theta'-\phi)}{2k_F},\sigma_2} = \\
& -\frac{1}{2\mu} \frac{k_F}{\mu} \int \frac{d\theta'' d\kappa''}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{d\Omega''}{2\pi} \sum_{\sigma',\sigma''} (\tilde{\lambda}_0)_{\theta+\frac{q\sin(\theta-\phi)}{2k_F},\sigma_4;\theta''-\frac{q\sin(\theta''-\phi)}{2k_F},\sigma'} (\tilde{\lambda}_0)_{\theta''-\frac{q\sin(\theta''-\phi)}{2k_F},\sigma';\theta'+\frac{q\sin(\theta'-\phi)}{2k_F},\sigma_2} \\
& \times \text{Re} \left[\frac{1}{-i\Omega'' + v_F [\kappa'' - \frac{q}{2} \cos(\theta'' - \phi)]} \frac{1}{-i(\mu + \Omega'') + v_F [\kappa'' + \frac{q}{2} \cos(\theta'' - \phi)]} \right]. \quad (13)
\end{aligned}$$

The integrations over κ'' and Ω'' can be readily done. Apart from the overall factor of $1/\mu$ determined from the dimension of the quartic coupling, the counter term is proportional to k_F/μ . This reflects the fact that the phase space of the virtual particle-hole pairs is proportional to k_F . The phase space measured in the unit μ increases with decreasing μ . This extensive phase space is what promotes the quartic coupling to the marginal coupling although it has scaling dimension -1 [54]. One can incorporate the phase space to define a new dimensionless coupling function as $[F_{\theta,\theta'}(q,\phi)]_{\sigma_4;\sigma_3}^{\sigma_1;\sigma_2} = \frac{k_F}{\mu} (\tilde{\lambda}_0)_{\theta+\frac{q\sin(\theta-\phi)}{2k_F},\sigma_4;\theta'-\frac{q\sin(\theta'-\phi)}{2k_F},\sigma_3}^{\theta-\frac{q\sin(\theta-\phi)}{2k_F},\sigma_1;\theta'+\frac{q\sin(\theta'-\phi)}{2k_F},\sigma_2}$. The β functional for F becomes independent of k_F ,

$$\frac{dF_{\theta_1,\theta_2}^r(q,\phi)}{dl} = -\frac{1}{4\pi^2 v_F} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta F_{\theta_1,\theta}^r(q,\phi) F_{\theta,\theta_2}^r(q,\phi) \frac{\mu^2 v_F^2 q^2 \cos^2(\theta - \phi)}{[\mu^2 + v_F^2 q^2 \cos^2(\theta - \phi)]^2}. \quad (14)$$

Here, $r = s$ or a . $F_{\theta_1,\theta_2}^s(q,\phi)$ and $F_{\theta_1,\theta_2}^a(q,\phi)$ represent the projections of $[F_{\theta,\theta'}(q,\phi)]_{\sigma_4;\sigma_3}^{\sigma_1;\sigma_2}$ to the singlet and adjoint representations of a particle-hole pair for the $SU(2)$ group, respectively,

$$[F_{\theta_1,\theta_2}(q,\phi)]_{\sigma_4;\sigma_3}^{\sigma_1;\sigma_2} = \mathfrak{S}_{\sigma_4,\sigma_3}^{\sigma_1,\sigma_2} F_{\theta_1,\theta_2}^s(q,\phi) + \mathfrak{A}_{\sigma_4,\sigma_3}^{\sigma_1,\sigma_2} F_{\theta_1,\theta_2}^a(q,\phi), \quad (15)$$

where $\mathfrak{S}_{\sigma_4,\sigma_3}^{\sigma_1,\sigma_2} = \frac{1}{2} \delta_{\sigma_4}^{\sigma_1} \delta_{\sigma_3}^{\sigma_2}$ and $\mathfrak{A}_{\sigma_4,\sigma_3}^{\sigma_1,\sigma_2} = \delta_{\sigma_3}^{\sigma_1} \delta_{\sigma_4}^{\sigma_2} - \frac{1}{2} \delta_{\sigma_4}^{\sigma_1} \delta_{\sigma_3}^{\sigma_2}$. From now on, we omit the superscript r because the following analysis holds for both channels.

The beta functional in Eq. (14) vanishes at $q = 0$ for any non-zero μ . This is consistent with the fact that the strict forward scattering amplitude is exactly marginal. However, for any non-zero

μ , the beta functional is non-trivial for $q \neq 0$. This has interesting consequences. First, when the theory flows to a fixed point in the low-energy limit, the full coupling function of the local effective field theory exhibits a scale invariance when the momentum transfer is comparable with energy scale. Second, the non-trivial renormalization group flow of the non-forward scattering amplitude can create instabilities if the bare coupling is sufficiently negative. In the following, we discuss these consequences in detail.

For a fixed momentum transfer, we can view the coupling F as a matrix of two angles that play the role of continuous indices. Here, the product of two matrices is given by $(\mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{B})_{\theta_1, \theta_2} = \int \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \mathbf{A}_{\theta_1 \theta} \mathbf{B}_{\theta \theta_2}$ and $\mathbf{M}^{-1}$ denotes the inverse of matrix $\mathbf{M}$. Then, Eq. (14) can be cast into $\frac{d\mathbf{F}}{dl} = -\mathbf{F} \cdot \mathbf{D} \cdot \mathbf{F}$, where $\mathbf{D}_{\theta, \theta'} = -\frac{1}{v_F} \frac{\mu^2 v_F^2 q^2 \cos^2(\theta - \phi)}{[\mu^2 + v_F^2 q^2 \cos^2(\theta - \phi)]^2} \delta(\theta - \theta')$. Multiplying $\mathbf{F}^{-1}$ on both sides of Eq. (14), we obtain

$$\frac{d[\mathbf{F}(q, \phi)]_{\theta, \theta'}^{-1}}{dl} = \frac{1}{v_F} \delta(\theta - \theta') \frac{\mu^2 v_F^2 q^2 \cos^2(\theta - \phi)}{[\mu^2 + v_F^2 q^2 \cos^2(\theta - \phi)]^2}. \quad (16)$$

At scale μ , the beta functional is largest for $q \cos(\theta - \phi) \sim \mu$. For $\theta - \phi \sim \pi/2$, the phase space of q is largest because virtual particle-hole pairs with momentum $\vec{q}$ cost the least energy in the region of the Fermi surface where $\vec{q}$ is tangential to the Fermi surface. The solution of Eq. (16) is given by

$$[\mathbf{F}(q, \phi; \mu)]_{\theta, \theta'}^{-1} = \frac{\delta(\theta - \theta')}{2v_F} \left[\frac{v_F^2 q^2 \cos^2(\theta - \phi)}{\mu^2 + v_F^2 q^2 \cos^2(\theta - \phi)} - \frac{v_F^2 q^2 \cos^2(\theta - \phi)}{\Lambda^2 + v_F^2 q^2 \cos^2(\theta - \phi)} \right] + [\mathbf{F}(q, \phi; \Lambda)]_{\theta, \theta'}^{-1}, \quad (17)$$

where $\mathbf{F}(q, \phi; \Lambda)$ is the coupling function at the UV cutoff, Λ . One can combine the last two terms to define the coupling function at $\mu = \infty$ to simplify the solution as

$$[\mathbf{F}(q, \phi; \mu)]_{\theta, \theta'}^{-1} = \frac{1}{2v_F} \delta(\theta - \theta') \frac{v_F^2 q^2 \cos^2(\theta - \phi)}{\mu^2 + v_F^2 q^2 \cos^2(\theta - \phi)} + [\mathbf{F}(q, \phi; \infty)]_{\theta, \theta'}^{-1}. \quad (18)$$

A. Scale invariance of Fermi liquid fixed points

Let us first consider the case in which no eigenvalue of $\mathbf{F}$ diverges at any μ . In this case, the theory is expected to flow to a Fermi liquid fixed point in the low-energy limit if the interaction is repulsive in the pairing channel. It is noted that the $\mu \rightarrow 0$ limit and the $q \rightarrow 0$ limit do not commute. In the strict forward scattering limit ($q = 0$), the coupling function does not depend on μ at all. On the other hand, if one takes the $\mu \rightarrow 0$ limit for a fixed $q \neq 0$, the coupling function

saturates to $[\mathbf{F}(q, \phi; 0)]_{\theta, \theta'}^{-1} = \frac{1}{8\pi^2 v_F} \delta(\theta - \theta') + [\mathbf{F}(q, \phi; \infty)]_{\theta, \theta'}^{-1}$ in the low-energy limit. The non-trivial crossover between these two limits can be captured by the scale invariant coupling function defined by $[\tilde{\mathbf{F}}(\tilde{q}, \phi; \mu)]_{\theta, \theta'} \equiv [\mathbf{F}(\mu\tilde{q}, \phi; \mu)]_{\theta, \theta'}$, where $\tilde{q} = q/\mu$ corresponds to the dimensionless momentum transfer measured in the unit of μ . This allows us to probe the kinematic region with small but non-zero momentum transfers. By taking the $\mu \rightarrow 0$ limit with fixed $\tilde{q}$, the coupling function becomes

$$\lim_{\mu \rightarrow 0} [\tilde{\mathbf{F}}(\tilde{q}, \phi; \mu)]_{\theta, \theta'}^{-1} = \frac{\delta(\theta - \theta')}{2v_F} \frac{v_F^2 \tilde{q}^2 \cos^2(\theta - \phi)}{1 + v_F^2 \tilde{q}^2 \cos^2(\theta - \phi)} + [\mathbf{F}(0, 0; \infty)]_{\theta, \theta'}^{-1}. \quad (19)$$

Here, we use the fact that $[\mathbf{F}(q, \phi; \infty)]_{\theta, \theta'}$ is an analytic function of $\vec{q}$. In the $\mu \rightarrow 0$ limit, only $[\mathbf{F}(q = 0, \phi = 0; \infty)]_{\theta, \theta'}$ enters in the expression for the fixed point coupling function. Eq. (19) corresponds to the fixed point of a beta functional, $\left. \frac{d[\tilde{\mathbf{F}}(\tilde{q}, \phi)]_{\theta, \theta'}}{d\ell} \right|_{\tilde{q}, \theta, \theta'} = \left. \frac{d[\mathbf{F}(q, \phi)]_{\theta, \theta'}}{d\ell} \right|_{q, \theta, \theta'} - \tilde{q} \frac{\partial [\tilde{\mathbf{F}}(\tilde{q}, \phi)]_{\theta, \theta'}}{\partial \tilde{q}}$, where the second term in the new beta functional corresponds to a momentum dilatation that ‘magnifies’ the region with small momentum transfers as the low-energy limit is taken. It is noted that the scale invariant coupling function obeys the $z = 1$ scaling. The momentum transfer and energy scale in the same way because the energy of a particle-hole pair with momentum $\vec{q} = q(\cos \phi, \sin \phi)$ created near the Fermi surface at angle θ scales linearly in q as far as $\theta - \phi \neq \pi/2$. Eq. (19) is the central result of our paper. The local coupling function captures the full extent of the scale invariant Fermi liquid fixed point away from the strict forward scattering limit. As expected, the only UV information that is kept in the fixed point coupling is the forward scattering amplitude at $\vec{q} = 0$.

In general, it is not easy to invert Eq. (19) to write down $[\tilde{\mathbf{F}}(\tilde{q}, \phi; \mu)]_{\theta, \theta'}$ in a closed form⁴. If the UV coupling function is non-zero only in one angular momentum channel, the coupling function in the IR limit can be easily obtained. To see this, we start by writing Eq. (17) in the space of angular momentum,

$$[\mathbf{F}(q, \phi; \mu)]_{\ell, \ell'}^{-1} = \int \frac{d\theta}{8\pi^2 v_F} \left[\frac{v_F^2 q^2 \cos^2(\theta - \phi)}{\mu^2 + v_F^2 q^2 \cos^2(\theta - \phi)} - \frac{v_F^2 q^2 \cos^2(\theta - \phi)}{\Lambda^2 + v_F^2 q^2 \cos^2(\theta - \phi)} \right] e^{i(\ell - \ell')\theta} + [\mathbf{F}(q, \phi; \Lambda)]_{\ell, \ell'}^{-1}, \quad (20)$$

where ℓ and ℓ' are conjugate momenta associated with θ and θ' , respectively, and $\mathbf{M}_{\ell, \ell'} = \int \frac{d\theta d\theta'}{(2\pi)^2} \mathbf{M}_{\theta, \theta'} e^{i(\ell\theta - \ell'\theta')}$. In the angular momentum basis, the fixed point coupling function can

⁴ If the UV coupling is weak, we can write down the fixed point coupling function in powers of the UV coupling

function as $[\tilde{\mathbf{F}}(\tilde{q}, \phi; \mu)]_{\theta, \theta'} = [\mathbf{F}(0, \phi; \infty)]_{\theta, \theta'} - \frac{1}{8\pi^2 v_F} \int_0^{2\pi} d\Theta [\mathbf{F}(0, \phi; \infty)]_{\theta, \Theta} \frac{v_F^2 \tilde{q}^2 \cos^2(\Theta - \phi)}{1 + v_F^2 \tilde{q}^2 \cos^2(\Theta - \phi)} [\mathbf{F}(0, \phi; \infty)]_{\Theta, \theta'} + \dots$

be written as

$$\mathbf{F}(q, \phi; \mu) = [\mathbf{F}(q, \phi; \Lambda)] \left([\mathcal{D}'(q, \phi; \mu, \Lambda) \mathbf{F}(q, \phi; \Lambda)] + I \right)^{-1}, \quad (21)$$

where $\mathcal{D}'_{\ell, \ell'}(q, \phi; \mu, \Lambda) = e^{i(\ell - \ell')\phi} \mathcal{D}_{\ell, \ell'}(q; \mu, \Lambda)$ with $\mathcal{D}_{\ell, \ell'}(q; \mu, \Lambda) = [D_{\ell - \ell'}(q; \mu) - D_{\ell - \ell'}(q; \Lambda)]$ and

$$D_{\ell - \ell'}(q; \mu) = \frac{1}{8\pi^2 v_F} \int d\theta e^{i\theta(\ell - \ell')} \frac{v_F^2 q^2 \cos^2(\theta)}{\mu^2 + v_F^2 q^2 \cos^2(\theta)}. \quad (22)$$

$D_\ell(q, \mu)$ vanishes for odd ℓ . For $\ell = 0, 2, 4$, it takes the form of

$$\begin{aligned} D_0(q; \mu) &= \frac{1}{4\pi v_F} \left[1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{v_F^2 q^2}{\mu^2}}} \right], \\ D_2(q; \mu) &= \frac{1}{4\pi v_F} \frac{\mu^2}{v_F^2 q^2} \left[\sqrt{1 + \frac{v_F^2 q^2}{\mu^2}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{v_F^2 q^2}{\mu^2}}} - 2 \right], \\ D_4(q; \mu) &= \frac{1}{4\pi v_F} \frac{\mu}{v_F q} \left[\frac{4\mu}{v_F q} \left(1 + \frac{2\mu^2}{v_F^2 q^2} - \frac{2\mu}{v_F q} \sqrt{\frac{\mu^2}{v_F^2 q^2} + 1} \right) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\frac{\mu^2}{v_F^2 q^2} + 1}} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

1. *s-wave*




FIG. 2. RG flow of $[\tilde{\mathbf{F}}(\tilde{q}, \phi; \mu)]_{\theta, \theta'}$ for a momentum-independent UV coupling function $[\mathbf{F}(q, \phi; \Lambda)]_{\theta, \theta'} = \alpha$ with (a) $\alpha = 1$ and (b) $\alpha = -1$. For both plots, we choose $v_F = 0.3$ and $\Lambda = 10$. For the angle-independent UV coupling function, $[\tilde{\mathbf{F}}(\tilde{q}, \phi; \mu)]_{\theta, \theta'}$ remains independent of ϕ , θ and θ' at all scales. The coupling function in the $\mu \rightarrow 0$ limit represents the fixed point profile.

Let us first consider the case where the forward scattering amplitude of the UV coupling is independent of angles, $[\mathbf{F}(q, \phi; \Lambda)]_{\theta, \theta'} = \alpha$, where α denotes the strength of the coupling

in the s-wave channel. In the basis of angular momentum, the UV coupling is written as $[\mathbf{F}(q, \phi; \Lambda)]_{\ell, \ell'} = \alpha \delta_{\ell, 0} \delta_{\ell', 0}$. Using $[\mathcal{D}'(q, \phi; \mu, \Lambda) \mathbf{F}(q, \phi; \Lambda)]_{\ell, \ell'} = \alpha \mathcal{D}'_{\ell, 0}(q, \phi; \mu, \Lambda) \delta_{\ell', 0}$, we can write $\mathcal{D}'(q, \phi; \mu, \Lambda) \mathbf{F}(q, \phi; \Lambda) + I$ as

$$\mathcal{D}'(q, \phi; \mu, \Lambda) \mathbf{F}(q, \phi; \Lambda) + I = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & \alpha \mathcal{D}'_{-2}(q, \phi; \mu, \Lambda) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 + \alpha \mathcal{D}'_0(q, \phi; \mu, \Lambda) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \alpha \mathcal{D}'_2(q, \phi; \mu, \Lambda) & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (24)$$

where the matrix elements are explicitly shown only in the 5×5 block of $-2 \leq \ell, \ell' \leq 2$. This leads to the isotropic IR quartic coupling function, $\mathbf{F}(q, \phi; \mu) = \mathbf{F}(q, \phi; \Lambda) [\mathcal{D}'(q, \phi; \mu, \Lambda) \mathbf{F}(q, \phi; \Lambda) + I]^{-1} = \delta_{\ell, 0} \delta_{\ell', 0} F(q, \phi; \mu)$, where $F(q, \phi; \mu) = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha \mathcal{D}_{0, 0}(q; \mu, \Lambda) + 1} = \alpha \left\{ \frac{\alpha}{4\pi v_F} \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{v_F^2 q^2}{\Lambda^2}}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{v_F^2 q^2}{\mu^2}}} \right] + 1 \right\}^{-1}$. In the space of angles, we readily obtain $[\mathbf{F}(q, \phi; \mu)]_{\theta, \theta'} = \frac{\alpha}{\frac{\alpha}{4\pi v_F} \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{v_F^2 q^2}{\Lambda^2}}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{v_F^2 q^2}{\mu^2}}} \right] + 1}$. Fig. 2 shows the

evolution of coupling functions. In the low-energy limit, the coupling function converges to the fixed point profile,

$$[\tilde{\mathbf{F}}(\tilde{q}, \phi; 0)]_{\theta, \theta'} = \frac{\alpha}{\frac{\alpha}{4\pi v_F} \left[1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + v_F^2 \tilde{q}^2}} \right] + 1}. \quad (25)$$

2. d-wave

As the next example, let us consider the case where the UV coupling has only the d-wave component, $[\mathbf{F}(q, \phi; \Lambda)]_{\theta, \theta'} = 2\alpha \cos[2(\theta - \theta')]$. In the angular momentum basis, the UV coupling function can be written as $[\mathbf{F}(q, \phi; \Lambda)]_{\ell, \ell'} = \alpha(\delta_{\ell, -2} \delta_{\ell', -2} + \delta_{\ell, 2} \delta_{\ell', 2})$. From

$$\sum_{\ell''} \mathcal{D}'_{\ell, \ell''}(q, \phi; \mu, \Lambda) [\mathbf{F}(q, \phi; \Lambda)]_{\ell'', \ell'} = \alpha [\mathcal{D}'_{\ell, -2}(q, \phi; \mu, \Lambda) \delta_{\ell', -2} + \mathcal{D}'_{\ell, 2}(q, \phi; \mu, \Lambda) \delta_{\ell', 2}], \quad (26)$$

we obtain the 5×5 block of $\mathcal{D}'(q, \phi; \mu, \Lambda) \mathbf{F}(q, \phi; \Lambda) + I$ for $-2 \leq \ell, \ell' \leq 2$ as

$$\mathcal{D}'(q, \phi; \mu, \Lambda) \mathbf{F}(q, \phi; \Lambda) + I = \begin{bmatrix} 1 + \alpha \mathcal{D}'_0(q, \phi; \mu, \Lambda) & 0 & 0 & 0 & \alpha \mathcal{D}'_{-4}(q, \phi; \mu, \Lambda) \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \alpha \mathcal{D}'_2(q, \phi; \mu, \Lambda) & 0 & 1 & 0 & \alpha \mathcal{D}'_{-2}(q, \phi; \mu, \Lambda) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \alpha \mathcal{D}'_4(q, \phi; \mu, \Lambda) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 + \alpha \mathcal{D}'_0(q, \phi; \mu, \Lambda) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (27)$$




FIG. 3. RG flow of $[\tilde{\mathbf{F}}(\tilde{q}, \phi=0; \mu)]_{\pi/8, 0}$ for a d-wave UV coupling function $[\mathbf{F}(q, \phi; \Lambda)]_{\theta, \theta'} = 2\alpha \cos[2(\theta - \theta')]$ for (a) $\alpha = 2$, and (b) $\alpha = -2$. We use $v_F = 0.3$ and $\Lambda = 10$.




FIG. 4. $[\tilde{\mathbf{F}}(\tilde{q}=10, \phi=0; \mu)]_{\theta, 0}$ plotted as a function of θ at different values of μ for (a) $\alpha = 2$ and (b) $\alpha = -2$. The same UV coupling function and parameters are used as in Fig. 3.

The non-zero components of the IR coupling function is obtained to be

$$[\mathbf{F}(q, \phi; \mu)]_{\ell, \ell'} = \alpha \frac{[1 + \alpha \mathcal{D}_0(q; \mu, \Lambda)](\delta_{\ell, 2} \delta_{\ell', 2} + \delta_{\ell, -2} \delta_{\ell', -2}) - \alpha \mathcal{D}_4(q; \mu, \Lambda)(e^{4i\phi} \delta_{\ell, 2} \delta_{\ell', -2} + e^{-4i\phi} \delta_{\ell, -2} \delta_{\ell', 2})}{1 + 2\alpha \mathcal{D}_0(q; \mu, \Lambda) + \alpha^2 [\mathcal{D}_0^2(q; \mu, \Lambda) - \mathcal{D}_4^2(q; \mu, \Lambda)]}. \quad (28)$$

This can be readily transformed back to the angle basis as

$$[\mathbf{F}(q, \phi; \mu)]_{\theta, \theta'} = 2\alpha \frac{[1 + \alpha \mathcal{D}_0(q; \mu, \Lambda)] \cos[2(\theta - \theta')] - \alpha \mathcal{D}_4(q; \mu, \Lambda) \cos[2(\theta + \theta') - 4\phi]}{1 + 2\alpha \mathcal{D}_0(q; \mu, \Lambda) + \alpha^2 [\mathcal{D}_0^2(q; \mu, \Lambda) - \mathcal{D}_4^2(q; \mu, \Lambda)]}. \quad (29)$$

In the $\mu \rightarrow 0$ limit, the coupling function takes the universal form given by

$$[\tilde{\mathbf{F}}(\tilde{q}, \phi; 0)]_{\theta, \theta'} = 2\alpha \frac{[1 + \alpha \tilde{D}_0(\tilde{q})] \cos[2(\theta - \theta')] - \alpha \tilde{D}_4(\tilde{q}) \cos[2(\theta + \theta') - 4\phi]}{1 + 2\alpha \tilde{D}_0(\tilde{q}) + \alpha^2 [\tilde{D}_0^2(\tilde{q}) - \tilde{D}_4^2(\tilde{q})]}, \quad (30)$$

where $\tilde{q} = q/\mu$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{D}_0(x) &= \frac{1}{4\pi v_F} \left[1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + v_F^2 x^2}} \right], \\ \tilde{D}_4(x) &= \frac{1}{4\pi v_F} \left[-\frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + v_F^2 x^2}} + \frac{4}{v_F^2 x^2} \left(1 + \frac{2}{v_F^2 x^2} - \frac{2}{v_F x} \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{v_F^2 x^2}} \right) \right].\end{aligned}\quad (31)$$

The evolution of the coupling function is shown in Fig. 3. In Fig. 4, the coupling function is shown as a function of angle at different energy scales.

B. Instabilities of Fermi liquids in the particle-hole channel

So far, we have considered the cases where the theory flows to the Fermi liquid fixed point in the low energy limit. If the UV coupling is sufficiently attractive in one or more angular momentum channel, some eigenvalues of the coupling function can diverges at low energies, signifying potential instabilities. However, this instability in the particle-hole channel requires a finite strength of coupling. While the perturbative analysis is not expected to be quantitatively valid, the main point of this analysis is to highlight the importance of quantum corrections to non-forward scatterings for particle-hole instabilities.

1. the *s*-wave channel




FIG. 5. RG flow of $[\mathbf{F}(q, \phi; \mu)]_{\theta, \theta'}$ for an attractive UV coupling function $[\mathbf{F}(q, \phi; \Lambda)]_{\theta, \theta'} = \alpha$ with (a) $\alpha = -(4\pi v_F + 1)$ and (b) $\alpha = -(4\pi v_F + 3)$. The coupling function diverges at the momentum cutoff, which is chosen to be $q_c = \pi$, at $\mu_c = 0.0198\Lambda$ and $\mu_c = 0.046\Lambda$, respectively. We use $\Lambda = 10$ and $v_F = 0.3$.




FIG. 6. The profile of the coupling function that emerges in the $\mu \rightarrow \mu_c$ limit from the UV coupling function $[\mathbf{F}(q, \phi; \Lambda)]_{\theta, \theta'} = \alpha$ for different values of α . For stable Fermi liquids, with $\alpha > -4\pi v_F \sqrt{1 + v_F^2 \frac{q^2}{\Lambda^2}}$, $\mu_c = 0$. For unstable cases, the critical energy scales are given by $\mu_c = 0.580$, $\mu_c = 0.995$, $\mu_c = 1.288$ for $\alpha = -8$, $\alpha = -14$, $\alpha = -20$, respectively for the choice of $v_F = 0.3$ and $\Lambda = 10$.

Let us first consider the angle independent UV coupling function, $[\mathbf{F}(q, \phi; \Lambda)]_{\theta, \theta'} = \alpha$. For $\alpha > -4\pi v_F$, eigenvalues of the coupling function remain finite at all energy scales. The coupling function that emerges in the $\mu \rightarrow 0$ limit represents the scale invariant Fermi liquid fixed point. The renormalization group flow changes qualitatively for sufficiently attractive interaction with $\alpha \leq -4\pi v_F$. For $\alpha \leq -4\pi v_F$, the coupling function decreases indefinitely at a momentum $q = q_c$ as μ approaches a critical energy scale μ_c , where q_c and μ_c are determined from the energy dispersion. Here, we take a simple approach where the quadratic energy dispersion is assumed to be valid upto a momentum cutoff q_c . In this case, the divergence of the coupling function arises at q_c . If $q_c \gg \mu_c$, the low-energy effective theory description is not valid. Therefore, one needs to be careful in interpreting the divergence of the coupling function at q larger than μ_c . With this cautionary remark, we show the evolution of coupling in the deep attractive region in Fig. 5. This divergence of the four-fermion coupling at a non-zero q can potentially represent a charge or spin density wave instability, depending on whether the divergence is in the spin singlet or the triplet channel[57]. In Fig. 6, we show the evolution of $[\tilde{\mathbf{F}}(\tilde{q}, \phi; \mu_c)]_{\theta, \theta'}$ as the strength of the UV coupling is tuned.




FIG. 7. RG flow of $[\mathbf{F}(q, \phi = 0; \mu)]_{\frac{\pi}{8}, 0}$ for an attractive UV coupling function $[\mathbf{F}(q, \phi; \Lambda)]_{\theta, \theta'} = 2\alpha \cos[2(\theta - \theta')]$ with (a) $\alpha = -(4\pi v_F + 1)$ and (b) $\alpha = -(4\pi v_F + 3)$. The coupling function diverges at the momentum cutoff $q_c = \pi$ at $\mu_c = 0.122$ and $\mu_c = 0.362$, respectively. We use $\Lambda = 10$ and $v_F = 0.3$.




FIG. 8. $[\mathbf{F}(q, \phi = 0; \mu)]_{\theta, 0}$ plotted as a function of θ at q_c at different values of μ for (a) $\alpha = -(4\pi v_F + 1)$ and (b) $\alpha = -(4\pi v_F + 3)$. The critical energy scales correspond to $\mu_c = 0.122$ and $\mu_c = 0.362$, respectively. The same UV coupling function and parameters are used as in Fig. 7.

2. the d-wave channel

Next, let us consider the case where the UV coupling is attractive in the d-wave channel with $[\mathbf{F}(q, \phi; \infty)]_{\theta, \theta'} = 2\alpha \cos[2(\theta - \theta')]$. In Fig. 7, we plot the evolution of $[\mathbf{F}(q, \phi = 0; \mu)]_{\frac{\pi}{8}, 0}$ as μ is lowered. For $\alpha \leq \alpha_c = -4\pi v_F$, the coupling function at $q = q_c$ diverges as a critical energy scale μ_c is approached. Fig. 8 shows the angular dependence of $[\mathbf{F}(q_c, \phi = 0; \mu)]_{\theta, 0}$ at different μ/Λ . A large attractive interaction for particle-hole pairs in the d-wave channel with a non-zero momentum promotes a distortion of the Fermi surface with a spatial modulation. This corresponds to a bond density wave that causes a spatial modulation in the pattern of rotational symmetry breaking.

Fig. 10 shows how $[\mathbf{F}(q, \phi = 0; \mu_c)]_{\theta, 0}$ evolves as α is varied. For $\alpha > \alpha_c$, the coupling function converges to a fixed profile in the low-energy limit. On the other hand, the amplitude of the




FIG. 9. The profile of the coupling function that emerges in the $\mu \rightarrow \mu_c$ limit from the UV coupling function $[\mathbf{F}(q, \phi; \Lambda)]_{\theta, \theta'} = 2\alpha \cos[2(\theta - \theta')]$ for different values of α . $\mu_c = 0$ for stable Fermi liquids with $\alpha > -4\pi v_F \sqrt{1 + v_F^2 \frac{q^2}{\Lambda^2}}$. For unstable cases, the critical energy scales are given by $\mu_c = 0.491$, $\mu_c = 0.937$, $\mu_c = 1.243$ for $\alpha = -8$, $\alpha = -14$, $\alpha = -20$, respectively for $v_F = 0.3$ and $\Lambda = 10$.

coupling function grows without a bound as μ approaches μ_c for $\alpha \leq \alpha_c$.

IV. PAIRING CHANNEL

In this section, we discuss the renormalization group flow for the general pairing interaction that includes Cooper pairs with non-zero center of mass momentum. The counter term from the one-loop vertex correction reads

$$\begin{aligned}
& (A_1^\lambda)_{\theta - \frac{Q \sin(\theta' - \Phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_1; \theta' + \pi + \frac{Q \sin(\theta' - \Phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_2} \left(\lambda_1 \right)_{\theta - \frac{Q \sin(\theta - \Phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_4; \theta + \pi + \frac{Q \sin(\theta - \Phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_3} = \\
& \frac{1}{2\mu} \frac{k_F}{\mu} \int \frac{d\theta'' d\kappa''}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{d\Omega''}{2\pi} \sum_{\sigma', \sigma''} (\tilde{\lambda}_1)_{\theta'' - \frac{Q' \sin(\theta'' - \Phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma'; \theta'' + \pi + \frac{Q \sin(\theta'' - \Phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma''} (\tilde{\lambda}_1)_{\theta'' - \frac{Q \sin(\theta'' - \Phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma'; \theta'' + \pi + \frac{Q \sin(\theta'' - \Phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma''} \\
& \times Re \left[\frac{1}{-i\Omega'' + \frac{1}{2m} \left[2k_F \kappa'' + (\kappa'')^2 + (k_F + \kappa'') Q \cos(\theta'' - \Phi) + \frac{Q^2}{4} \right]} \right. \\
& \quad \left. \times \frac{1}{-i(\mu - \Omega'') + \frac{1}{2m} \left[2k_F \kappa'' + (\kappa'')^2 - (k_F + \kappa'') Q \cos(\theta'' - \Phi) + \frac{Q^2}{4} \right]} \right]. \tag{32}
\end{aligned}$$

The factor of k_F/μ represents the extensive phase space available for virtual Cooper pairs in the loop. We define a dimensionless coupling function that incorporates the phase space as $[V_{\theta', \theta}(Q, \Phi)]_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2}^{\sigma_4, \sigma_3} \equiv \frac{k_F}{\mu} (\tilde{\lambda}_1)_{\theta - \frac{Q \sin(\theta' - \Phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_1; \theta' + \pi + \frac{Q \sin(\theta' - \Phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_2}^{\theta'' - \frac{Q \sin(\theta'' - \Phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_4; \theta + \pi + \frac{Q \sin(\theta - \Phi)}{2k_F}, \sigma_3}$. The beta functional for this new coupling




FIG. 10. The coupling function at the critical energy scale plotted as a function of θ and q for the UV coupling function $[\mathbf{F}(q, \phi; \Lambda)]_{\theta, \theta'} = 2\alpha \cos[2(\theta - \theta')]$. (a) The coupling function at $\mu = \mu_c$ at $q = q_c$ for various choices of α . (b) The coupling function at $\mu = 0$ for $\alpha = 12$. (c) The coupling function at $\mu = 0$ for $\alpha = -2$. (d) The coupling function at $\mu_c = 0.937$ for various choices of momenta for $\alpha = -14$. $\Lambda = 10$ and $v_F = 0.3$ are used for all plots.

is given by

$$\frac{dV_{\theta_1, \theta_2}^r(Q, \Phi)}{dl} = -\frac{1}{8\pi^2 v_F} \int d\theta V_{\theta_1, \theta}^r(Q, \Phi) \left[\frac{\mu^2}{\mu^2 + v_F^2 Q^2 \cos^2(\theta - \Phi)} \right] V_{\theta, \theta_2}^r(Q, \Phi). \quad (33)$$

Here, $r = +$ or $-$. $V_{\theta_1, \theta_2}^+(Q, \Phi)$ and $V_{\theta_1, \theta_2}^-(Q, \Phi)$ represent the pairing interactions in the spin triplet and singlet channels, respectively,

$$[V_{\theta', \theta}(Q, \Phi)]_{\sigma_4, \sigma_3}^{\sigma_1, \sigma_2} = \mathcal{S}_{\sigma_4, \sigma_3}^{\sigma_1, \sigma_2} V_{\theta_1, \theta_2}^+(Q, \Phi) + \mathcal{A}_{\sigma_4, \sigma_3}^{\sigma_1, \sigma_2} V_{\theta_1, \theta_2}^-(Q, \Phi), \quad (34)$$

where $\mathcal{S}_{\sigma_4, \sigma_3}^{\sigma_1, \sigma_2} = \frac{1}{2}(\delta_{\sigma_3}^{\sigma_1} \delta_{\sigma_4}^{\sigma_2} + \delta_{\sigma_4}^{\sigma_1} \delta_{\sigma_3}^{\sigma_2})$ and $\mathcal{A}_{\sigma_4, \sigma_3}^{\sigma_1, \sigma_2} = \frac{1}{2}(\delta_{\sigma_4}^{\sigma_1} \delta_{\sigma_3}^{\sigma_2} - \delta_{\sigma_3}^{\sigma_1} \delta_{\sigma_4}^{\sigma_2})$. From now on, we focus on one spin channel and omit the superscript r in V . For Cooper pairs with zero center of mass momentum, we set $Q = 0$ to reproduce the well-known beta functional [2], $\frac{dV_{\theta_1, \theta_2}(0, 0)}{dl} = -\frac{1}{8\pi^2 v_F} \int d\theta V_{\theta_1, \theta}(0, 0) V_{\theta, \theta_2}(0, 0)$.

For general Q , the solution of the beta functional is written as

$$[\mathbf{V}(Q, \Phi; \mu)]_{\theta, \theta'}^{-1} = \frac{\delta(\theta - \theta')}{4v_F} \log \left[\frac{\Lambda^2 + v_F^2 Q^2 \cos^2(\theta - \Phi)}{\mu^2 + v_F^2 Q^2 \cos^2(\theta - \Phi)} \right] + [\mathbf{V}(Q, \Phi; \Lambda)]_{\theta, \theta'}^{-1}, \quad (35)$$

where $[\mathbf{V}(Q, \Phi; \Lambda)]_{\theta, \theta'}$ denotes the pairing interaction at UV cutoff Λ . The most important aspect of Eq. (35) is the logarithmic singularity that is present at $Q = 0$ and $\mu = 0$. If $[\mathbf{V}(Q, \Phi; \Lambda)]_{\theta, \theta'}$ is repulsive in all angular momentum channels, the coupling function flows to zero logarithmically. On the other hand, the coupling function at $Q = 0$ diverges at a critical energy scale if $[\mathbf{V}(Q, \Phi; \Lambda)]_{\theta, \theta'}$ has any channel with a negative eigenvalue. This is the well-known BCS instability. Here, we focus on the scaling behaviour of the coupling function at non-zero Q . To remove the logarithmic divergence, we consider the difference of Eq. (35) at two momenta, Q and Q_* . In the $\mu \rightarrow 0$ limit with fixed $\tilde{Q} = Q/\mu$ and $\tilde{Q}_* = Q_*/\mu$, the difference becomes

$$\lim_{\mu \rightarrow 0} \left([\tilde{\mathbf{V}}(\tilde{Q}, \Phi; \mu)]_{\theta, \theta'}^{-1} - [\tilde{\mathbf{V}}(\tilde{Q}_*, \Phi; \mu)]_{\theta, \theta'}^{-1} \right) = \frac{\delta(\theta - \theta')}{4v_F} \log \left[\frac{1 + v_F^2 \tilde{Q}_*^2 \cos^2(\theta - \Phi)}{1 + v_F^2 \tilde{Q}^2 \cos^2(\theta - \Phi)} \right] \quad (36)$$

where $[\tilde{\mathbf{V}}(\tilde{Q}, \Phi; \mu)]_{\theta, \theta'} = [\mathbf{V}(\mu\tilde{Q}, \Phi; \mu)]_{\theta, \theta'}$.




FIG. 11. The RG evolution of $[\mathbf{V}(Q, \phi; \mu)]_{\theta, \theta'}$ for the UV coupling in the s-wave channel with strength (a) $V_0(Q; \Lambda) = 1$ and (b) $V_0(Q; \Lambda) = -1$ with $\mu_c = 0.023$. (c) The coupling function that emerges in the $\mu \rightarrow \mu_c$ limit for different UV couplings. For repulsive UV couplings with $V_0(Q; \Lambda) > 0$, the coupling function vanishes in the IR limit ($\mu_c = 0$). For attractive couplings with $V_0(Q; \Lambda) = -1, -2, -3, -4$, the pairing interaction $Q = 0$ diverges at $\mu_c = 0.23, 1.51, 2.84, 3.89$, respectively. We use $\Lambda = 10$ and $v_F = 0.3$.

Now, let us consider a simple case the UV coupling function is non-zero only in the s-wave spin-singlet channel. The beta functional for the coupling in the s-wave channel becomes

$$\frac{dV_0(Q; \mu)}{dl} = -\frac{1}{8\pi^2 v_F} V_0^2(Q; \mu) \int d\theta \frac{\mu^2}{\mu^2 + v_F^2 Q^2 \cos^2(\theta)}, \quad (37)$$

where V_0 represents the coupling in the s-wave channel. The solution is written as

$$V_0(Q; \mu) = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{8\pi v_F} \log \left[\frac{\sqrt{v_F^2 Q^2 + \Lambda^2 + \Lambda} \sqrt{v_F^2 Q^2 + \mu^2 - \mu}}{\sqrt{v_F^2 Q^2 + \Lambda^2 - \Lambda} \sqrt{v_F^2 Q^2 + \mu^2 + \mu}} \right] + [V_0(Q; \Lambda)]^{-1}}, \quad (38)$$

where $V_0(Q; \Lambda)$ is the s-wave coupling defined at UV cutoff scale Λ . In Fig. 11, we plot the evolution of the coupling functions for different choices of the UV coupling in the s-wave channel. In this example, the scale invariance is expressed as

$$\lim_{\mu \rightarrow 0} \tilde{V}_0(\tilde{Q}; \mu) = \frac{1}{[\tilde{V}_0(\tilde{Q}_*)]^{-1} + \frac{1}{8\pi v_F} \log \left[\frac{\sqrt{v_F^2 \tilde{Q}_*^2 + 1} + 1}{\sqrt{v_F^2 \tilde{Q}_*^2 + 1} - 1} \frac{\sqrt{v_F^2 \tilde{Q}^2 + 1} - 1}{\sqrt{v_F^2 \tilde{Q}^2 + 1} + 1} \right]} \quad (39)$$

in the $\mu \rightarrow 0$ limit with fixed $\tilde{Q}$ and $\tilde{Q}_*$.

V. SUMMARY

In summary, we study Landau Fermi liquid and its instabilities within the low-energy effective field theory that is valid beyond the strict zero energy limit. The local effective field theory should include general coupling functions that include non-forward scatterings and pairing interactions with non-zero center of mass momenta. At low energies, the coupling functions exhibit universal scaling behaviours when the momentum transfer and the center of mass momentum are comparable to the energy scale. The scaling behaviour of the general coupling functions should be imprinted in scaling functions of various physical observables[5–7, 58]. In principle, the universal non-forward scattering amplitudes can be directly tested through the double photoemission spectroscopy[59].

The local low-energy effective field theory valid away from the strict zero energy limit also reveals new types of instabilities of Fermi liquids. Unlike the forward scattering amplitude that is exactly marginal, the non-forward scattering amplitudes are subject to non-trivial quantum corrections. If the strength of the bare attractive interaction exceeds a critical strength, it can drive instabilities toward symmetry broken states in particle-hole channels.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Research at the Perimeter Institute is supported in part by the Government of Canada through Industry Canada, and by the Province of Ontario through the Ministry of Research and Information. SL also acknowledges the support by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council

of Canada.

-
- [1] L. Landau, “The theory of a Fermi liquid,” *Sov. Phys. JETP* **3**, 920 (1957).
 - [2] R. Shankar, “Renormalization-group approach to interacting fermions,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **66**, 129–192 (1994).
 - [3] J. Polchinski, “Effective Field Theory and the Fermi Surface,” ArXiv High Energy Physics - Theory e-prints (1992), [hep-th/9210046](#).
 - [4] G. Benfatto and G. Gallavotti, “Renormalization-group approach to the theory of the fermi surface,” *Phys. Rev. B* **42**, 9967–9972 (1990).
 - [5] Andrey V. Chubukov, Dmitrii L. Maslov, and Andrew J. Millis, “Nonanalytic corrections to the specific heat of a three-dimensional Fermi liquid,” *Phys. Rev. B* **73**, 045128 (2006).
 - [6] Andrey V. Chubukov and Dmitrii L. Maslov, “Singular corrections to the Fermi-liquid theory,” *Phys. Rev. B* **69**, 121102 (2004).
 - [7] H. K. Pal, V. I. Yudson, and D. L. Maslov, “Resistivity of non-Galilean-invariant Fermi- and non-Fermi liquids,” *Lithuanian Journal of Physics and Technical Sciences* **52**, 142–164 (2012), [arXiv:1204.3591 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
 - [8] Sankar Das Sarma and Yunxiang Liao, “Know the enemy: 2D Fermi liquids,” *Annals of Physics* **435**, 168495 (2021), special issue on Philip W. Anderson.
 - [9] T. Holstein, R. E. Norton, and P. Pincus, “de Haas-van Alphen Effect and the Specific Heat of an Electron Gas,” *Phys. Rev. B* **8**, 2649–2656 (1973).
 - [10] John A. Hertz, “Quantum critical phenomena,” *Phys. Rev. B* **14**, 1165–1184 (1976).
 - [11] Patrick A. Lee, “Gauge field, aharonov-bohm flux, and high- T_c superconductivity,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **63**, 680–683 (1989).
 - [12] M. Yu. Reizer, “Relativistic effects in the electron density of states, specific heat, and the electron spectrum of normal metals,” *Phys. Rev. B* **40**, 11571–11575 (1989).
 - [13] Patrick A. Lee and Naoto Nagaosa, “Gauge theory of the normal state of high- T_c superconductors,” *Phys. Rev. B* **46**, 5621–5639 (1992).
 - [14] C. M. Varma, P. B. Littlewood, S. Schmitt-Rink, E. Abrahams, and A. E. Ruckenstein, “Phenomenology of the normal state of Cu-O high-temperature superconductors,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **63**,

1996–1999 (1989).

- [15] A. J. Millis, “Effect of a nonzero temperature on quantum critical points in itinerant fermion systems,” *Phys. Rev. B* **48**, 7183–7196 (1993).
- [16] B. L. Altshuler, L. B. Ioffe, and A. J. Millis, “Low-energy properties of fermions with singular interactions,” *Phys. Rev. B* **50**, 14048–14064 (1994).
- [17] Yong Baek Kim, Akira Furusaki, Xiao-Gang Wen, and Patrick A. Lee, “Gauge-invariant response functions of fermions coupled to a gauge field,” *Phys. Rev. B* **50**, 17917–17932 (1994).
- [18] Chetan Nayak and Frank Wilczek, “Non-fermi liquid fixed point in $2 + 1$ dimensions,” *Nuclear Physics B* **417**, 359 – 373 (1994).
- [19] Joseph Polchinski, “Low-energy dynamics of the spinon-gauge system,” *Nuclear Physics B* **422**, 617–633 (1994).
- [20] A. Abanov and Andrey V. Chubukov, “Spin-fermion model near the quantum critical point: One-loop renormalization group results,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 5608–5611 (2000).
- [21] A. Abanov, Andrey V. Chubukov, and J. Schmalian, “Quantum-critical theory of the spin-fermion model and its application to cuprates: Normal state analysis,” *Adv. Phys.* **52**, 119–218 (2003).
- [22] A. Abanov and A. Chubukov, “Anomalous scaling at the quantum critical point in itinerant antiferromagnets,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 255702 (2004).
- [23] Hilbert v. Löhneysen, Achim Rosch, Matthias Vojta, and Peter Wölfle, “Fermi-liquid instabilities at magnetic quantum phase transitions,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **79**, 1015–1075 (2007).
- [24] T. Senthil, “Critical fermi surfaces and non-fermi liquid metals,” *Phys. Rev. B* **78**, 035103 (2008).
- [25] Sung-Sik Lee, “Low-energy effective theory of Fermi surface coupled with $U(1)$ gauge field in $2 + 1$ dimensions,” *Phys. Rev. B* **80**, 165102 (2009).
- [26] David F. Mross, John McGreevy, Hong Liu, and T. Senthil, “Controlled expansion for certain non-fermi-liquid metals,” *Phys. Rev. B* **82**, 045121 (2010).
- [27] Max A. Metlitski and Subir Sachdev, “Quantum phase transitions of metals in two spatial dimensions. I. Ising-nematic order,” *Phys. Rev. B* **82**, 075127 (2010).
- [28] Max A. Metlitski and Subir Sachdev, “Quantum phase transitions of metals in two spatial dimensions. II. Spin density wave order,” *Phys. Rev. B* **82**, 075128 (2010).
- [29] Sean A. Hartnoll, Diego M. Hofman, Max A. Metlitski, and Subir Sachdev, “Quantum critical response at the onset of spin-density-wave order in two-dimensional metals,” *Phys. Rev. B* **84**, 125115

(2011).

- [30] Elihu Abrahams and Peter Wölfe, “Critical quasiparticle theory applied to heavy fermion metals near an antiferromagnetic quantum phase transition,” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **109**, 3238 (2012).
- [31] H.-C. Jiang, M. S. Brock, R. V. Mishmash, J. R. Garrison, D. Sheng, O. I. Motrunich, and M. P. Fisher, “Non-fermi-liquid d-wave metal phase of strongly interacting electrons,” *Nature* **493**, 39 (2013).
- [32] A. Liam Fitzpatrick, Shamit Kachru, Jared Kaplan, and S. Raghu, “Non-fermi-liquid fixed point in a wilsonian theory of quantum critical metals,” *Phys. Rev. B* **88**, 125116 (2013).
- [33] Denis Dalidovich and Sung-Sik Lee, “Perturbative non-fermi liquids from dimensional regularization,” *Phys. Rev. B* **88**, 245106 (2013).
- [34] Philipp Strack and Pawel Jakubczyk, “Fluctuations of imbalanced fermionic superfluids in two dimensions induce continuous quantum phase transitions and non-fermi-liquid behavior,” *Phys. Rev. X* **4**, 021012 (2014).
- [35] Shouvik Sur and Sung-Sik Lee, “Chiral non-fermi liquids,” *Phys. Rev. B* **90**, 045121 (2014).
- [36] Aavishkar A. Patel and Subir Sachdev, “dc resistivity at the onset of spin density wave order in two-dimensional metals,” *Phys. Rev. B* **90**, 165146 (2014).
- [37] Shouvik Sur and Sung-Sik Lee, “Quasilocal strange metal,” *Phys. Rev. B* **91**, 125136 (2015).
- [38] Sam P. Ridgway and Chris A. Hooley, “Non-fermi-liquid behavior and anomalous suppression of landau damping in layered metals close to ferromagnetism,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 226404 (2015).
- [39] Tobias Holder and Walter Metzner, “Anomalous dynamical scaling from nematic and u(1) gauge field fluctuations in two-dimensional metals,” *Phys. Rev. B* **92**, 041112 (2015).
- [40] Aavishkar A. Patel, Philipp Strack, and Subir Sachdev, “Hyperscaling at the spin density wave quantum critical point in two-dimensional metals,” *Phys. Rev. B* **92**, 165105 (2015).
- [41] C. M. Varma, “Quantum criticality in quasi-two-dimensional itinerant antiferromagnets,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 186405 (2015).
- [42] Andreas Eberlein, “Self-energy effects in functional renormalization group flows of the two-dimensional $t-t'$ hubbard model away from van hove filling,” *Phys. Rev. B* **92**, 235146 (2015).
- [43] Yoni Schattner, Samuel Lederer, Steven A. Kivelson, and Erez Berg, “Ising Nematic Quantum Critical Point in a Metal: A Monte Carlo Study,” *Phys. Rev. X* **6**, 031028 (2016).
- [44] Shouvik Sur and Sung-Sik Lee, “Anisotropic non-fermi liquids,” *Phys. Rev. B* **94**, 195135 (2016).

- [45] Debanjan Chowdhury, Yochai Werman, Erez Berg, and T. Senthil, “Translationally invariant non-fermi-liquid metals with critical fermi surfaces: Solvable models,” *Phys. Rev. X* **8**, 031024 (2018).
- [46] Chandra M. Varma, W. J. Gannon, M. C. Aronson, J. A. Rodriguez-Rivera, and Y. Qiu, “Quantum critical singularities in two-dimensional metallic XY ferromagnets,” *Phys. Rev. B* **97**, 085134 (2018).
- [47] Weicheng Ye, Sung-Sik Lee, and Liujun Zou, “Ultraviolet-infrared mixing in marginal fermi liquids,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128**, 106402 (2022).
- [48] Sung-Sik Lee, “Recent developments in non-fermi liquid theory,” *Annu. Rev. of Condens. Matter Phys.* **9**, 227–244 (2018).
- [49] Dominic V. Else, Ryan Thorngren, and T. Senthil, “Non-fermi liquids as ersatz fermi liquids: General constraints on compressible metals,” *Phys. Rev. X* **11**, 021005 (2021).
- [50] Zhengyan Darius Shi, Hart Goldman, Dominic V. Else, and T. Senthil, “Gifts from anomalies: Exact results for Landau phase transitions in metals,” arXiv e-prints , arXiv:2204.07585 (2022), [arXiv:2204.07585 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.07585).
- [51] A. H. Castro Neto and Eduardo Fradkin, “Bosonization of fermi liquids,” *Phys. Rev. B* **49**, 10877–10892 (1994).
- [52] A. Houghton, H.-J. Kwon, and J. B. Marston, “Multidimensional bosonization,” *Advances in Physics* **49**, 141–228 (2000), <https://doi.org/10.1080/000187300243363>.
- [53] Luca V. Delacretaz, Yi-Hsien Du, Umang Mehta, and Dam Thanh Son, “Nonlinear Bosonization of Fermi Surfaces: The Method of Coadjoint Orbits,” arXiv e-prints , arXiv:2203.05004 (2022), [arXiv:2203.05004 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.05004).
- [54] Francisco Borges, Anton Borissov, Ashutosh Singh, Andrés Schliefl, and Sung-Sik Lee, “Field-theoretic functional renormalization group formalism for non-fermi liquids and its application to the antiferromagnetic quantum critical metal in two dimensions,” *Annals of Physics* **450**, 169221 (2023).
- [55] Sung-Sik Lee, “Stability of the U(1) spin liquid with a spinon Fermi surface in $2 + 1$ dimensions,” *Phys. Rev. B* **78**, 085129 (2008).
- [56] S.-W. Tsai, A. H. Castro Neto, R. Shankar, and D. K. Campbell, “Renormalization-group approach to strong-coupled superconductors,” *Phys. Rev. B* **72**, 054531 (2005).
- [57] Boris Spivak and Steven A. Kivelson, “Phases intermediate between a two-dimensional electron liquid and Wigner crystal,” *Phys. Rev. B* **70**, 155114 (2004).

- [58] Andrey V. Chubukov and Dmitrii L. Maslov, “First-Matsubara-frequency rule in a Fermi liquid. I. Fermionic self-energy,” *Phys. Rev. B* **86**, 155136 (2012).
- [59] R. Herrmann, S. Samarin, H. Schwabe, and J. Kirschner, “Two electron photoemission in solids,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 2148–2151 (1998).