

Friedel oscillation in non-Fermi liquid: Lesson from exactly solvable Hatsugai-Kohmoto model

Miaomiao Zhao,^{1,2} Wei-Wei Yang,^{1,2} Hong-Gang Luo,^{1,2,3} and Yin Zhong^{1,2,*}

¹*School of Physical Science and Technology & Key Laboratory for Magnetism and Magnetic Materials of the MoE, Lanzhou University, Lanzhou 730000, China*

²*Lanzhou Center for Theoretical Physics, Key Laboratory of Theoretical Physics of Gansu Province*

³*Beijing Computational Science Research Center, Beijing 100084, China*

When non-magnetic impurity immerses in Fermi sea, a regular modulation of charge density around impurity will appear and such phenomena is called Friedel oscillation (FO). Although both Luttinger liquid and Landau Fermi liquid show such characteristic oscillation, FO in generic non-Fermi liquid (NFL) phase is still largely unknown. Here, we show that FO indeed exists in NFL state of an exactly solvable model, i.e. the Hatsugai-Kohmoto model which has been intensively explored in recent years. Combining T-matrix approximation and linear-response-theory, an interesting picture emerges, if two interaction-induced quasi-particles bands in NFL are partially occupied, FO in this situation is determined by a novel structure in momentum space, i.e. the 'average Fermi surface' (average over two quasi-particle Fermi surface), which highlights the inter-band particle-hole excitation. We hope our study here provides a counterintuitive example in which FO with Fermi surface coexists with NFL quasi-particle, and it may be useful to detect hidden 'average Fermi surface' structure in other correlated electron systems.

I. INTRODUCTION

Recently, an exactly solvable many-body fermionic model with an infinite-range interaction, i.e. the Hatsugai-Kohmoto (HK) model,¹⁻³ has been hotly studied.⁴⁻²¹ In contrast with celebrated and more familiar Sachdev-Ye-Kitaev, Kitaev's toric code and honeycomb model with either quenched disorder or local Z_2 gauge symmetry,²²⁻²⁹ the original HK model has translation invariance with topologically trivial nature, but surprisingly, it provides a strictly exact playground for non-Fermi liquid (NFL) and featureless Mott insulator in any spatial dimension, which is rare in statistical mechanics and condensed matter physics.

The solvability of HK model results from its locality in momentum space and one can diagonalize HK Hamiltonian (just diagonal 4×4 -matrix) for each momentum. The current studies have mainly focused on an interesting extension of HK model, i.e. the superconducting instability from the intrinsic NFL state in HK model,⁶ which is inspired by ubiquitous NFL behaviors and their link to unconventional superconductivity in cuprate, iron-based superconductors (SC) and many heavy fermion compounds. Unexpected properties such as topological s -wave pairing and two-stage superconductivity have been discovered.^{8,9,13} However, before comparing these novel theoretical predictions with real-world unconventional SC in cuprate or heavy fermion systems, one should note that non-magnetic impurity is essential to explain realistic thermodynamic and transport data in SC, e.g. impurity effect changes linear- T behavior in superfluid density of the nodal d -wave pairing state into T^2 form.³⁰ However, to our knowledge, the mentioned non-magnetic impurity effect has not been investigated in HK model, let alone the superconducting HK system.

For metals, it is well-known that non-magnetic impu-

riety immersed in Fermi sea induces a regular modulation of charge density around impurity, e.g. the Friedel oscillation (FO).³¹ When involving electron-electron interaction, both the Luttinger liquid in one spatial dimension ($d = 1$) and the Landau Fermi liquid (FL) show such characteristic oscillation.³²⁻³⁷ The origin of FO is generally believed to tie to the $2k_F$ singularity of density-density correlation in the system with sharp Fermi surface, thus even quantum spin liquid with ghost (spinon) Fermi surface may show signature of FO.^{38,39} Consequently, FO can act as diagnosis for fermionic system with well-defined Fermi surface whatever its FL or NFL nature and may shed light on how to detect putative NFL state in realistic quantum materials proposed by existing effective field theory or slave-particle theory.⁴⁰⁻⁵⁰

Therefore, considering the need of exploration on FO for generic NFL phases and the request from superconducting HK models, in this work, we take a first step study on this timely issue. Specifically, we focus on the simplest but essential case in non-magnetic impurity effect, i.e. the possible FO in single impurity problem.

To our surprise, we find that the conventional wisdom of FO must be extended, since the NFL phase in HK model with two Fermi surface but no FL quasi-particle, indeed shows clear signature of FO. As a matter of fact, FO in this situation is determined by a novel structure in momentum space, i.e. the 'average Fermi surface', this means the average over the mentioned two Fermi surface and it results from the inter-band particle-hole excitation.

After all, our study here provides a counterintuitive example in which Fermi surface coexisting with NFL quasi-particle can support the existence of FO, and we expect that it may be interesting to detect hidden 'average Fermi surface' structure in other correlated electron systems.

The remaining part of this article is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we give a quick review of HK model, which will be useful in next sections. Sec. III is devoted




FIG. 1. (a) The Hatsugai-Kohmoto (HK) model in one spatial dimension and (b) on a square lattice with hopping t and interaction U . (c) The exact ground-state phase diagram for HK model exhibits a Mott insulator and a non-Fermi-liquid-like metal. (μ denotes chemical potential, $U_c = W$ and W is band-width) The transition from metallic state to gapped Mott insulating phase belongs to the universality of the continuous Lifshitz transition.

to the discussion of FO in terms of T -matrix approximation and the linear-response theory. Discussion will be given in Sec. IV. Finally, a brief summary is given in Sec. V.

II. THE HATSUGAI-KOHMOTO MODEL

The HK model we study has the following form, (see also Fig. 1(a) and (b) for illustration of HK model in one spatial dimension and on a square lattice)

$$\hat{H} = - \sum_{i,j,\sigma} t_{ij} \hat{c}_{i\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j\sigma} - \mu \sum_{j\sigma} \hat{c}_{j\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j\sigma} + \frac{U}{N_s} \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4} \delta_{j_1+j_3=j_2+j_4} \hat{c}_{j_1\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j_2\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j_3\downarrow}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j_4\downarrow}. \quad (1)$$

Here, $\hat{c}_{j\sigma}^\dagger$ is the creation operator of conduction electron (called c -electron for simplicity) at site j with spin $\sigma = \uparrow, \downarrow$ and it satisfies anti-commutative relation $[\hat{c}_{i\sigma}, \hat{c}_{j\sigma'}^\dagger]_+ = \delta_{i,j} \delta_{\sigma,\sigma'}$. t_{ij} are hopping integral between i, j sites. Furthermore, chemical potential μ has been added to fix electron's density. N_s is the number of sites. The last term of \hat{H} is the HK interaction,¹ unlike the usual on-site Hubbard interaction $U \sum_j \hat{c}_{j\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j\uparrow} \hat{c}_{j\downarrow}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j\downarrow}$, HK interaction is an infinite-range interaction between four electrons but preserves the center of motion due to the constraint of Dirac's δ function. This interaction plays a fundamental role in solving this model as we will see later. Amusingly, one may note that the HK interaction indeed includes the Hubbard interaction if we consider a two-site version of HK model. However, the true effect of the latter one for HK-like models beyond perturbative treatment is still unknown and such issue seems to be important for our further understanding on HK-like systems.

Importantly, Eq. 1 is local in momentum space after Fourier transformation (i.e. $\hat{c}_{j\sigma} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N_s}} \sum_k e^{ikR_j} \hat{c}_{k\sigma}$) and the resultant Hamiltonian reads as $\hat{H} = \sum_k \hat{H}_k$,

$$\hat{H}_k = \sum_{\sigma} (\varepsilon_k - \mu) \hat{c}_{k\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{k\sigma} + U \hat{c}_{k\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{c}_{k\uparrow} \hat{c}_{k\downarrow}^\dagger \hat{c}_{k\downarrow}, \quad (2)$$

where ε_k are dispersion of electrons. It is emphasized that the locality of above Hamiltonian stems from infinite-range HK interaction preserving center of motion. In contrast, the Hubbard interaction in momentum space is rather nonlocal as $U \sum_{k,k',q} \hat{c}_{k+q}^\dagger \hat{c}_{k\uparrow} \hat{c}_{k'-q\downarrow} \hat{c}_{k'\downarrow}$, thus it cannot lead to solvability for $d > 1$.

Now, if we choose Fock state

$$|n_1, n_2\rangle \equiv (\hat{c}_{k\uparrow}^\dagger)^{n_1} |0\rangle (\hat{c}_{k\downarrow}^\dagger)^{n_2} |0\rangle \quad (3)$$

with $n_i = 0, 1$ as basis, \hat{H}_k can be written as a diagonal 4×4 matrix, whose eigen-energy is $0, \varepsilon_k - \mu, \varepsilon_k - \mu, 2(\varepsilon_k - \mu) + U$ and the corresponding eigen-state is $|0\rangle_k \equiv |00\rangle, |\sigma = \uparrow\rangle_k \equiv |10\rangle, |\sigma = \downarrow\rangle_k \equiv |01\rangle, |\uparrow\downarrow\rangle_k \equiv |11\rangle$, which means states are empty, single occupied with spin-up and spin-down, and double occupied.

Therefore, the many-body ground-state of \hat{H} is just the direct-product state of each \hat{H}_k 's ground-state, i.e. $|\Psi_g\rangle = \prod_{k \in \Omega_0} |0\rangle_k \prod_{k \in \Omega_1} |\sigma\rangle_k \prod_{k \in \Omega_2} |\uparrow\downarrow\rangle_k$. ($\Omega_0, \Omega_1, \Omega_2$ are the momentum range for different occupation) Because states with spin-up or down electron in Ω_1 is degenerated without external magnetic field, the ground-state of HK model has huge degeneracy. This point must be kept in mind if one performs numerical calculation like exact diagonalization (ED) which only selects one of ground-states.¹⁶

If $\Omega_0 = \Omega_2 = 0$, the system is a Mott insulator which happens when $U > U_c = W$ with W being the bandwidth of c -electron. Otherwise, we obtain a metallic state with NFL properties, e.g. violation of Luttinger theorem, Haldane's exclusion statistics and Curie-like spin susceptibility.^{3,6,51} It is interesting to note that as a result of HK interaction which preserves the center of motion, NFL states do not have collective mode in charge degree of freedom, such as the plasmon in Coulomb electron gas or zero sound in FL.^{52,53} Moreover, the transition from metallic state to gapped Mott insulating phase belongs to the universality of the continuous Lifshitz transition, in which the chemical potential-tuning and the interaction-tuning Mott transition have identical critical exponents.^{51,54} (see also Fig. 1(c)) Similarly, excited states and their energy are easy to be constructed, so \hat{H} (Eq. 1) has been solved since all eigen-states and eigen-energy are found.

For our purpose, it is useful to present the single-particle Green's function and some ground-state or thermodynamic quantities for HK model. For example, the single-particle Green's function can be obtained in terms of equation of motion,⁵⁵ (see Appendix. A) which is read

as

$$\begin{aligned} G_\sigma(k, \omega) &= \frac{1 + \frac{U \langle \hat{n}_{k\bar{\sigma}} \rangle}{\omega - (\varepsilon_k - \mu + U)}}{\omega - (\varepsilon_k - \mu)} \\ &= \frac{1 - \langle \hat{n}_{k\bar{\sigma}} \rangle}{\omega - (\varepsilon_k - \mu)} + \frac{\langle \hat{n}_{k\bar{\sigma}} \rangle}{\omega - (\varepsilon_k - \mu + U)} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $\langle \hat{n}_{k\bar{\sigma}} \rangle$ is the expectation value of electron number operator $\hat{n}_{k\bar{\sigma}} = \hat{c}_{k\bar{\sigma}}^\dagger \hat{c}_{k\bar{\sigma}}$ with spin $\bar{\sigma} = -\sigma$. The pole structure implies that there exist two quasi-particle bands as

$$E_{k-} = \varepsilon_k - \mu, \quad E_{k+} = \varepsilon_k - \mu + U, \quad (5)$$

which corresponds to holon $\hat{h}_{k\sigma} = \hat{c}_{k\sigma}(1 - \hat{n}_{k\bar{\sigma}})$ and doublon $\hat{d}_{k\sigma} = \hat{c}_{k\sigma}\hat{n}_{k\bar{\sigma}}$. In fact, the related Green's function is found to be

$$\langle \langle \hat{h}_{k\sigma} | \hat{h}_{k\sigma}^\dagger \rangle \rangle_\omega = \frac{1 - \langle \hat{n}_{k\bar{\sigma}} \rangle}{\omega - \varepsilon_k + \mu} = \frac{1 - \langle \hat{n}_{k\bar{\sigma}} \rangle}{\omega - E_{k-}},$$

$$\langle \langle \hat{d}_{k\sigma} | \hat{d}_{k\sigma}^\dagger \rangle \rangle_\omega = \frac{\langle \hat{n}_{k\bar{\sigma}} \rangle}{\omega - \varepsilon_k + \mu - U} = \frac{\langle \hat{n}_{k\bar{\sigma}} \rangle}{\omega - E_{k+}}.$$

Thus, we see that the elementary excitations of HK model are holon and doublon. But we should emphasize that holon or doublon does not satisfy standard fermionic anti-commutative relation and cannot adiabatically evolve into $U = 0$ limit, thus they are not FL-like quasi-particle.

Since we are interested in paramagnetic states, we have $n_k = \langle \hat{n}_{k\sigma} \rangle = \langle \hat{n}_{k\bar{\sigma}} \rangle$ and it is straightforward to find

$$n_k = \frac{f_F(E_{k-})}{f_F(E_{k-}) + 1 - f_F(E_{k+})} \quad (6)$$

with the help of spectral theorem of $G_\sigma(k, \omega)$. ($f_F(x) = 1/(e^{x/T} + 1)$ is the Fermi distribution function)

Next, at finite- T , the thermodynamics of HK model is determined by its free energy density f , which is related to partition function \mathcal{Z} as

$$f = -\frac{T}{N_s} \ln \mathcal{Z}, \quad \mathcal{Z} = \text{Tr} e^{-\beta \hat{H}} = \prod_k \text{Tr} e^{-\beta \hat{H}_k} = \prod_k f_k.$$

Here, one notes that the partition function is easy to calculate since each k -state contributes independently. We have defined $f_k = 1 + 2z_k + z_k^2 e^{-\beta U}$ and $z_k = e^{-\beta(\varepsilon_k - \mu)}$. Then, the typical thermodynamic quantity, i.e. the heat capacity, is calculated by standard thermodynamic relation $C_V = -T \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial T^2}$. In addition to C_V , one can also calculate spin susceptibility χ_s if one inserts Zeeman energy term $\hat{H}_h = -B(\hat{c}_{k\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{c}_{k\uparrow} - \hat{c}_{k\downarrow}^\dagger \hat{c}_{k\downarrow})$ into Hamiltonian \hat{H}_k . Then, it follows that the magnetization $M = -\frac{\partial f}{\partial B}$ and $\chi_s = \frac{\partial M}{\partial B} = -\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial B^2}$.

At zero temperature, the free energy density reduces into the ground-state energy density, which has very simple expression,

$$e_g = \frac{1}{N_s} \sum_k [E_{k-} \theta(-E_{k-}) + E_{k+} \theta(-E_{k+})],$$

where $\theta(x)$ is the standard unit-step function ($\theta(x) = 1$ for $x > 0$ and $\theta(x) = 0$ if $x < 0$). Therefore, the electron density at $T = 0$ is found to be

$$n = -\frac{\partial e_g}{\partial \mu} = \frac{1}{N_s} \sum_k [\theta(-E_{k-}) + \theta(-E_{k+})]. \quad (7)$$

III. SINGLE IMPURITY IN HK MODEL

In this section, we study the impurity effect in HK model. It is well-known that for non-interacting Fermi gas and interacting FL or Luttinger liquid, the electron density around impurity shows characteristic oscillation called FO.

A. T -matrix approximation

Now, we consider the effect of a single impurity, which is assumed to locate on zero-th site and only electron on this site feels its scattering, thus we have the following impurity Hamiltonian:

$$\hat{H}_{imp} = V \sum_\sigma \hat{c}_{0\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{0\sigma} = \frac{V}{N_s} \sum_{k, k', \sigma} \hat{c}_{k\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{k'\sigma}$$

Here, V is the strength of impurity potential and the second term of the right-hand side is the Hamiltonian in momentum space.

If HK interaction is turned off, one can solve the non-interacting electron problem $\hat{H} + \hat{H}_{imp}$ in terms of T -matrix formalism, which means the Green's function satisfies the following equations,⁵⁶

$$\begin{aligned} G_\sigma^{(0)}(k, k', \omega) &= \delta_{k, k'} G_\sigma^{(0)}(k, \omega) + G_\sigma^{(0)}(k, \omega) T_\sigma(\omega) G_\sigma^{(0)}(k', \omega) \\ T_\sigma(\omega) &= \frac{V/N_s}{1 - V F_\sigma(\omega)}, \quad F_\sigma(\omega) = \frac{1}{N_s} \sum_k G_\sigma^{(0)}(k, \omega) \end{aligned}$$

Here, we have defined the so-called T -matrix $T_\sigma(\omega)$, which encodes the effect of impurity scattering. Meanwhile, $G^{(0)}$ denotes the Green's function for $U = 0$ and

$$G_\sigma^{(0)}(k, \omega) = \frac{1}{\omega - (\varepsilon_k - \mu)}.$$

However, one can see that when $U \neq 0$, \hat{H}_{imp} mixes different momentum sectors of original HK model (Eq.1), therefore, the solvability of HK model is lost and we can only obtain accurate results from numerical computation like ED.

To proceed, let us use the above T -matrix formalism as an approximation and we expect that such approximated treatment may be appropriate if impurity strength V is not large. Then, we replace non-interacting Green's function $G^{(0)}$ with interacting G without impurity (Eq. 4) as

what has usually been done in dynamic mean-field theory study or cuprate superconductor.^{57–59} So, we find

$$G_\sigma(k, k', \omega) \simeq \delta_{k, k'} G_\sigma(k, \omega) + G_\sigma(k, \omega) T_\sigma(\omega) G_\sigma(k', \omega)$$

$$T_\sigma(\omega) = \frac{V/N_s}{1 - V F_\sigma(\omega)}, \quad F_\sigma(\omega) = \frac{1}{N_s} \sum_k G_\sigma(k, \omega). \quad (8)$$

In reality, the effect of single impurity can be observed via the well-known FO,³¹ which states that the electron's density around impurity shows a characteristic oscillation behavior. For systems with well-defined Fermi surface, such as Landau FL in $d = 2, 3$ and Luttinger liquid in $d = 1$,^{32–37} the FO behaves as

$$\delta n_i \equiv n_i - n \sim \frac{\cos(2k_F |R_i|)}{|R_i|^g}, \quad |R_i| \gg 1$$

where n_i is the electron's density at i -site, n denotes the average electron density without impurity, R_i is the distance versus impurity (assumed on 0-site in our model), k_F is Fermi wavevector and g is equal to the spatial dimension for FL,³⁴ or determined by interaction strength in Luttinger liquid.^{32,36}

Our aim of this section is to examine whether the above FO survives in metallic NFL state of HK model. Mathematically, we can write δn_i as

$$\begin{aligned} \delta n_i &= \frac{1}{N_s} \sum_{k, k', \sigma} e^{i(k-k')R_i} \langle c_{k', \sigma}^\dagger c_{k, \sigma} \rangle - n \\ &= \frac{1}{N_s} \sum_{k, k', \sigma} e^{i(k-k')R_i} \int d\omega f_F(\omega) \frac{-1}{\pi} \text{Im} G(k, k', \omega) - n \\ &= \frac{1}{N_s} \sum_{k, k', \sigma} e^{i(k-k')R_i} \int d\omega f_F(\omega) \frac{-1}{\pi} \text{Im} \delta G_\sigma(k, k', \omega). \end{aligned}$$

Here, we have defined the scattering shifted Green's function $\delta G_\sigma(k, k', \omega) \equiv G_\sigma(k, \omega) T_\sigma(\omega) G_\sigma(k', \omega)$ and $f_F(x) = 1/(e^{x/T} + 1)$ is the Fermi distribution function. Next, sum over momentum, one finds

$$\delta n_i = \sum_\sigma \int d\omega f_F(\omega) \frac{-1}{\pi} \text{Im} \left[\frac{G_\sigma(R_i, \omega) V G_\sigma(-R_i, \omega)}{1 - V F_\sigma(\omega)} \right] \quad (9)$$

Here, $G_\sigma(R_i, \omega) = \frac{1}{N_s} \sum_k e^{ikR_i} G_\sigma(k, \omega)$ is the local Green's function on i -site. Then, we are able to utilize Eq. 9 to calculate δn_i , such that the check on FO is straightforward.

In Fig. 2 and 3, we have plotted δn_i for $V/t = 0.1, 0.2$ with different $U/t = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8$ and in 1D case. ($\varepsilon_k = -2t \cos(k)$) To explore both metallic and insulating phases, we have fixed $\mu = U/2$. Here, we see that if the system is located in metallic phase ($U/t \leq 4$), FO is clearly visible since all data is similar to non-interacting case ($U = 0$), which shows FO-like behavior as $\delta n_i \sim \frac{\cos(2k_F |R_i|)}{|R_i|}$. ($k_F = \pi/2$) In contrast, when the ground-state is in the Mott insulating phase ($U/t > 4$), signal of FO vanishes.




FIG. 2. δn_i for $U/t = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8$ with $V/t = 0.1$ and $\mu = U/2$.




FIG. 3. δn_i for $U/t = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8$ with $V/t = 0.2$ and $\mu = U/2$.

However, we should emphasize that although metallic NFL phase in HK shows FO and seems to fit with non-interacting formula $\delta n_i \sim \frac{\cos(2k_F |R_i|)}{|R_i|}$, there does not exist well-defined Fermi wave-vector in k_F . This fact can be seen in Fig. 4(a), where the particle distribution n_k (calculated with Eq. 6 at $T = 0$) shows FL-like jump at k_1 and k_2 but not at putative Fermi wavevector $k_F = \pi/2$. The jump at k_1, k_2 suggests two-Fermi-surface structure and their location is determined by

$$k_2 = \left| \arccos \frac{U - \mu}{2t} \right|, \quad k_1 = \left| \arccos \frac{-\mu}{2t} \right|,$$

which results from inspecting Eq. 6 at $T = 0$ ($n_k^{T=0} = \frac{1}{2} [\theta(2t \cos k + U/2) + \theta(2t \cos k - U/2)]$). If we focus on regime with $k > 0$, the jump at k_1 (k_2) corresponds to the occupation of electron from $n_{k\sigma} = 1$ to $1/2$ (from $1/2$ to 0). Furthermore, the real part of Green's function at zero-frequency ($\text{Re}G(k, 0)$) diverges at k_1, k_2 , (Fig. 4(b)) thus, we may call k_1, k_2 as quasi-Fermi wavevector.

At the same time, one is able to calculate density of electron in terms of k_2, k_1 ,

$$n = \overbrace{2k_1}^{\Omega_2} \frac{2}{2\pi} + \overbrace{2(k_2 - k_1)}^{\Omega_1} \frac{2}{2\pi} \frac{1}{2} = (k_1 + k_2) \frac{2}{2\pi} \equiv \frac{1}{\pi} 2k_a.$$

where the prefactor $\frac{2}{2\pi}$ denotes the density of state in momentum space with spin degeneracy while the factor




FIG. 4. (a) Electron's distribution function n_k and (b) the real (imaginary) part of single-particle Green's function at zero-frequency ($\text{Re}G(k, 0)$, $\text{Im}G(k, 0)$) for $U/t = 3, \mu = U/2$.

$\frac{1}{2}$ uncovers the fact that only single occupation exists in Ω_1 and we have $n_k = 1/2$ in this regime. We have also defined the average Fermi wavevector $k_a = (k_1 + k_2)/2$, whose effect is just like the Fermi wavevector k_F in 1D Fermi gas.

Note that, one observes zero point in the real part of Green's function ($\text{Re}G(k, 0)$), (Fig. 4(b)) such zero point defines the Luttinger surface instead of more familiar Fermi surface.⁶⁰ So, the corresponding characteristic wavevector is named Luttinger wavevector k_L . In our case, we find $k_L = \pi/2$ from $\text{Re}G(k = k_L, 0) = 0$ ($\mu = U/2$), which is identical to non-interacting Fermi wavevector k_F and the average Fermi wavevector k_a .

Considering k_L, k_a , we should identify which one determines the FO in NFL phase of HK,

$$\delta n_i^{HK} \sim \frac{\cos(2k_a |R_i|)}{|R_i|}, \quad |R_i| \gg 1,$$

or

$$\delta n_i^{HK} \sim \frac{\cos(2k_L |R_i|)}{|R_i|}, \quad |R_i| \gg 1.$$

B. Linear response theory

In last subsection, we have seen that in terms of T -matrix approximation, metallic NFL state in HK model indeed exhibits FO, but unexpectedly, it seems to be determined by Luttinger wavevector k_L or average Fermi wavevector k_a . To pin down which one is responsible for FO, here, we use linear response theory to estimate the electron density and it may be considered as a crosscheck on previous computation.

According to linear response theory,⁵⁶ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta n_i(t) &= \frac{1}{i} \int_{-\infty}^t dt' \langle [\hat{n}_i(t), \hat{H}_{imp}(t')] \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{i} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt' \theta(t-t') \langle [\hat{n}_i(t), \hat{n}_0(t')] \rangle V(t') \\ &= - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt' \chi_c(R_i, R_0, t-t') V(t') \end{aligned}$$

Here, the charge susceptibility is defined as

$$\chi_c(R_i, R_0, t-t') = -\frac{1}{i} \theta(t-t') \langle [\hat{n}_i(t), \hat{n}_0(t')] \rangle.$$

Thus, if we are able to calculate $\chi_c(R_i, R_0, t-t')$, the electron density is easy to obtain after integrating over time. Equivalently, $\delta n_i(t) = - \int \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} e^{-i\omega t} \chi_c(R_i, R_0, \omega) V(\omega)$ and $\chi_c(R_i, R_0, \omega) = \int dt e^{i\omega t} \chi_c(R_i, R_0, t)$.

In many-body physics, one always uses Wick rotation and calculates imaginary-time charge susceptibility

$$\chi_c(R_i, R_0, \tau) = \langle \hat{T}_\tau \hat{n}_i(\tau) \hat{n}_0 \rangle,$$

or its Fourier transformation $\chi_c(R_i, R_0, i\Omega_n)$. Finally, we obtain $\chi_c(R_i, R_0, \omega) = \chi_c(R_i, R_0, i\Omega_n \rightarrow \omega + i0^+)$.

In the framework of perturbation theory with the help of Feynman diagrams, using Wick theorem, one can calculate $\chi_c(R_i, R_0, i\Omega_n)$ or its Fourier transformation $\chi_c(q, i\Omega_n)$ easily. When interaction is turned off ($U = 0$), we just obtain (see Appendix. B)

$$\chi_c^{(0)}(q, i\Omega_n) = \frac{-1}{N_s \beta} \sum_{k, \omega_n} \sum_{\sigma} G_{\sigma}^{(0)}(k+q, \omega_n + \Omega_n) G_{\sigma}^{(0)}(k, \omega_n). \quad (10)$$

After frequency summation, one finds the standard result $\chi_c^{(0)}(q, i\Omega_n) = \frac{2}{N_s} \sum_k \frac{f_F(\varepsilon_{k+q-\mu}) - f_F(\varepsilon_{k-\mu})}{i\Omega_n - \varepsilon_{k+q} + \varepsilon_k}$.

However, for HK model, we have not noticed any perturbation theory which can reproduce the exact solution like Green's function or free energy. (Note however that Ref. 17 has proposed a Hartree-Fock based perturbation theory for HK model at $T = 0$.) Therefore, one should be careful when calculating multi-particle correlation like χ_c .

Fortunately, Ref. 4 and 61 tell us that, the charge and spin susceptibility of HK has identical formalism to familiar non-interacting electron gas (e.g. Eq. 10) and the only difference is to replace the non-interacting Green's function with the interacting one (Eq. 4). For HK model, we just replace $G_{\sigma}^{(0)}$ with G_{σ} and the explicit result is




FIG. 5. δn_i calculated from the linear response theory for $U/t = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8$ with $V/t = 0.1$ and $\mu = U/2$.

given by Ref. 4 as

$$\begin{aligned}
 \chi_c(q, i\Omega_n) &= \frac{-1}{N_s} \sum_{k, \sigma} (1 - n_k)(1 - n_{k+q}) \\
 &\times \frac{f_F(\varepsilon_k - \mu) - f_F(\varepsilon_{k+q} - \mu)}{i\Omega_n - \varepsilon_{k+q} + \varepsilon_k} \\
 &+ \frac{-1}{N_s} \sum_{k, \sigma} (1 - n_k)n_{k+q} \\
 &\times \frac{f_F(\varepsilon_k - \mu) - f_F(\varepsilon_{k+q} - \mu + U)}{i\Omega_n - \varepsilon_{k+q} - U + \varepsilon_k} \\
 &+ \frac{-1}{N_s} \sum_{k, \sigma} n_k(1 - n_{k+q}) \\
 &\times \frac{f_F(\varepsilon_k - \mu + U) - f_F(\varepsilon_{k+q} - \mu)}{i\Omega_n - \varepsilon_{k+q} + \varepsilon_k + U} \\
 &+ \frac{-1}{N_s} \sum_{k, \sigma} n_k n_{k+q} \\
 &\times \frac{f_F(\varepsilon_k - \mu + U) - f_F(\varepsilon_{k+q} - \mu + U)}{i\Omega_n - \varepsilon_{k+q} + \varepsilon_k} \quad (11)
 \end{aligned}$$

It is noted that the above density-density correlation function is not an approximation but is exact for HK model due to the solvability. It is easy to check that when $U = 0$, the above result reduces into the non-interacting one $\chi_c^{(0)}$.

Since the strength of impurity is static, we should have $V(\omega) = 2\pi V\delta(\omega)$, so $\delta n_i = -V\chi_c(R_i, R_0, \omega = 0)$. This can be calculated if we replace $i\Omega_n$ with $\omega + i0^+$ in Eq. 11 and make a Fourier transformation,

$$\delta n_i = -V \frac{1}{N_s} \text{Re} \left[\sum_q e^{iq(R_i - R_0)} \chi_c(q, i\Omega_n \rightarrow \omega + i0^+) \Big|_{\omega=0} \right] \quad (12)$$

In Fig. 5, we have plotted the results from the linear response theory and good agreement with our previous T -matrix calculation (Fig. 2) has been found.

Because, k_L and k_a are identical in the symmetric case $\mu = U/2$. Instead, we investigate the asymmetric case, e.g. the situation with electron density $n = 0.5$ in Fig. 6. (Results for electron density $n = 0.4$ and $n = 0.6$ are




FIG. 6. δn_i for $U/t = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4$ with $V/t = 0.1$ and electron density is fixed to 0.5.

shown Appendix. C and no physics is changed.) For this electron density, certain regime of quasi-particle bands $E_{k-} = \varepsilon_k - \mu$, $E_{k+} = \varepsilon_k - \mu + U$ are doubly occupied when U/t is small, in contrast, only E_{k-} band will be occupied when U/t is large. (See corresponding band structure $E_{k\pm}$ in Fig. 7.) Here, although FO is still visible but it is not easy to distinguish k_L and k_a , thus we plot $\chi_c(q, 0)$ ($\chi_c(q, 0) \propto \delta n(q)$, the Fourier transformation of δn_i) in Fig. 8, which is able to show the dominating wavevector for charge response.

As one can see from Fig. 8, when $U/t = 0$, the correct $2k_F$ singularity of non-interacting electron gas is reproduced as expected. This means we can approximate $\chi_c(q)$ as $\chi_c(2k_F)$ and it leads to $\delta n_i \sim \cos(2k_F(R_i - R_0))\chi_c(2k_F)$. Thus, the correct $2k_F$ oscillation of δn_i has been reproduced.

Next, if one enhances the interaction with $U/t = 1$, three dominating peaks located in $2k_1, 2k_2$ and $2k_a$ are found. In this case,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \delta n_i &\sim \cos(2k_1(R_i - R_0))\chi_c(2k_1) + \cos(2k_2(R_i - R_0))\chi_c(2k_2) \\
 &+ \cos(2k_a(R_i - R_0))\chi_c(2k_a),
 \end{aligned}$$

and the last one with $2k_a$ singularity appears to be the final winner. (We will provide an intuitive explanation later.)

In addition, if U is larger, $\chi_c(q, 0)$ has peak near π , which is just $2k_2$ since in this case, only one quasi-particle band E_{k-} has been occupied.

Actually, as can be seen in Fig. 7(b), one may consider $2k_a = k_1 + k_2$ as the inter-band particle-hole excitation (scattering) process induced by the HK interaction. In other words, this can be explained as the inter-band ' $2k_F$ ' singularity, which is in contrast with the intra-band ' $2k_F$ ' singularity like $2k_2$ in Fig. 7(d). At the same time, we see that in Eq. 11, the first and the fourth term are mainly dominated by intra-band particle-hole excitation while the second and the third term show inter-band particle-hole excitation. If one considers the numerator in Eq. 11, e.g. the prefactor of first term $(1 - n_k)(1 - n_{k+q})(f_F(\varepsilon_k - \mu) - f_F(\varepsilon_{k+q} - \mu))$ and the prefactor of third term $n_k(1 - n_{k+q})(f_F(\varepsilon_k - \mu + U) - f_F(\varepsilon_{k+q} - \mu))$, it is found that the former one is more mismatched than the latter one, thus




FIG. 7. The quasi-particle bands $E_{k-} = \varepsilon_k - \mu$, $E_{k+} = \varepsilon_k - \mu + U$ for $U/t = 0, 1, 2, 3$ with electron density $n = 0.5$.




FIG. 8. $\chi_c(q, 0)$ for $U/t = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4$ with $V/t = 0.1$ and electron density is fixed to 0.5.

the inter-band excitation (described by the second and third term in Eq. 11) wins over the intra-band excitation (the first and fourth term in Eq. 11). So, we expect that the charge susceptibility is determined by the average Fermi surface, which highlights the inter-band particle-hole excitation.

Therefore, we should conclude that FO in NFL state with two Fermi surface is determined by the average Fermi surface while NFL state with only one Fermi surface behaves like usual $2k_F$ singularity.

C. FO at finite temperature

Before ending this section, we try to explore the finite temperature effect of FO. It is expected that the thermal effect will wash out the sharp jump around Fermi surface, such that the charge response will be weakened if elevating temperature. Thus, the amplitude of FO decreases when temperature is increased, which can be seen in Fig. 9. Here, δn_i for $n = 0.5$ and $n = 1$ are shown in Fig. 9(a) and (b). We see that when $T/t \lesssim 0.1$, the amplitude of FO is visible while higher temperature does not lead to noticeable FO. The amplitude of FO has also been




FIG. 9. δn_i versus temperature for (a) $n = 0.5$ and (b) $n = 1.0$ with $V/t = 0.1$, $U/t = 2$. (c) δn_4 denotes amplitude of FO on the fourth nearest-neighbor site and (d) δn_1 is for the nearest-neighbor site around impurity.

fitted with exponential function $\sim e^{-T}$ and good agreement with the calculated ones has been found Fig. 9(c) and (d).

IV. DISCUSSION

A. FO on 2D square lattice

Now, we turn our attention to the 2D square lattice, where the dispersion of electron is chosen to be $\varepsilon_k = -2t(\cos k_x + \cos k_y)$. Generally, the findings in the 1D situation are still valid in the present 2D square lattice as can be seen in Figs. 10 and 11, which is not unexpected since the NFL states in HK model belong to the same universality class and the effect of space dimension does not change the nature of NFL. This feature is quite different from the case in Hubbard model, where NFL in 1D is faithfully described by the Luttinger liquid paradigm, however its extension to the most important 2D case is still lacking. In our opinion, such a difference may result from competing symmetry-breaking states involving charge-density, spin-density and pairing order in Hubbard model and including these orders for HK-like model is able to clarify this issue.

Fig. 10 shows δn_i for $U/t = 0$ and $U/t = 2$, and FO exists in these two situations despite of the latter one being a NFL. Furthermore, in Fig. 11(b), it is seen that $\chi_c(q, 0)$ in NFL is dominated by the average Fermi surface ($2k_a$ in the figure) as expected. As comparison the non-interacting Fermi gas in Fig. 11(a) has the usual $2k_F$ charge response. In addition, the two-Fermi-surface structure of quasi-particle in NFL exists in Fig. 11(d).




FIG. 10. δn_i on square lattice for (a) $U/t = 0$, (b) $U/t = 2$ with $V/t = 0.1$ and electron density is fixed to 0.5.




FIG. 11. $\chi_c(q, 0)$ (a)(b) and n_k (c)(d) on square lattice for $U/t = 0$ and $U/t = 2$ with $V/t = 0.1$ and electron density is fixed to 0.5.

B. More impurities?

In previous sections, we have studied the details of the single impurity problem and the clear signature of FO is shown in metallic NFL states. But, if more impurities are involved, what will happen? It is expected that if the density of impurities is small, the interference effect between impurities can be safely ignored and one just uses the picture of the single impurity problem. However, if more impurities exist, interference effect must be included, which invalidates the T-matrix formalism we have developed for single impurity case. Although we cannot make any definite prediction due to the lack of appropriate theoretical formalism, it seems that localization of electron (Anderson localization) is an inevitable one for strong impurity scattering. Future study on the interplay between localization and electron correlation in HK-like models is desirable and it may relate to the timely issue of quantum thermalization or many-body localization.⁶²

C. Magnetic impurity

In the main text, only effect from the nonmagnetic impurity is analyzed. However, we all know that the understanding on magnetic impurity is an essential issue in condensed matter physics, such as Kondo effect, Ruderman-Kittel-Kasuya-Yosida exchange interaction and the spin glass state.^{63,64} It is noted that the former one has already been explored by poorman's scaling approach and deviation from usual Kondo impurity in FL is noticeable.¹⁰

Due to the perturbative nature of poorman's scaling, the ground-state of Kondo impurity in HK model has not been established and it seems that the state-of-art numerical renormalization group, which is very successful on Kondo impurity in non-interacting environment,⁶⁵ cannot be utilized without nontrivial modification. To explore the ground-state, it will be helpful to follow the classic variational wave-function calculation of Yosida as the first step.⁶⁶

V. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE DIRECTION

In conclusion, we have found that Friedel oscillation exists in non-Fermi liquid phase in the HK model, which results from the calculation of T-matrix approximation and linear response theory. When there exists two-Fermi-surface structure, inter-band particle-hole excitation dominates and one observes the average Fermi surface. We should emphasize that the two-Fermi-surface structure in HK model is an intrinsic effect induced by interaction and no symmetry breaking is involved. This is in contrast with the usual multi-band system, in which the bands can appear without electron correlation.

In fact, besides the HK model, the average Fermi surface structure may naturally arise in many correlated electron systems, e.g. the phenomenological description of underdoped cuprate in terms of Yang-Rice-Zhang ansatz,⁶⁷ Hubbard-I approximation solution of Hubbard model, Falicov-Kimball model and Ising-Kondo lattice.^{55,68-70} Thus, it is interesting to examine whether the finding in this work is still valid in those more realistic systems, which contributes to our understanding on high-temperature cuprate superconductivity.

For future study, considering the recent progress on superconductivity in HK-like models,^{6,8,9,13} it will be interesting to explore the impurity effect in those superconducting phases in terms of the framework developed in this work. Since the superconducting phases in HK models are rather different from the usual Bardeen-Cooper-Schrieffer pairing state, we expect that impurity effect will be a good guide to identify the mentioned ones.

Therefore, we hope our work here provides a useful framework to understand Friedel oscillation and related impurity effect in exotic correlated electron models like HK model. Certain extensions of our work will contribute to the exploration of impurity effect in generic strongly

correlated electron systems.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge funding from the National Key Research and Development Program of China (Grant No.2022YFA1402704) and the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No.12047501 and No.11834005).

Appendix A: Derivation of single-particle Green's function

Follow the treatment of Hubbard model,⁵⁵ let us define the single-particle Green's function as $G_\sigma(k, \omega) = \langle\langle \hat{c}_{k\sigma} | \hat{c}_{k\sigma}^\dagger \rangle\rangle_\omega$, which is just the Fourier transformation of the retarded Green's function

$$G_\sigma(k, t) = -i\theta(t) \langle [\hat{c}_{k\sigma}(t), \hat{c}_{k\sigma}^\dagger]_+ \rangle.$$

Then, in terms of

$$\begin{aligned} [\hat{c}_{k\sigma}, \hat{H}] &= (\varepsilon_k - \mu) \hat{c}_{k\sigma} + U \hat{c}_{k\sigma} \hat{n}_{k\bar{\sigma}}, \\ [\hat{c}_{k\sigma} \hat{n}_{k\bar{\sigma}}, \hat{H}] &= (\varepsilon_k - \mu + U) \hat{c}_{k\sigma} \hat{n}_{k\bar{\sigma}}, \end{aligned}$$

we find

$$\omega \langle\langle \hat{c}_{k\sigma} | \hat{c}_{k\sigma}^\dagger \rangle\rangle_\omega = 1 + (\varepsilon_k - \mu) \langle\langle \hat{c}_{k\sigma} | \hat{c}_{k\sigma}^\dagger \rangle\rangle_\omega + U \langle\langle \hat{c}_{k\sigma} \hat{n}_{k\bar{\sigma}} | \hat{c}_{k\sigma}^\dagger \rangle\rangle_\omega$$

and

$$\omega \langle\langle \hat{c}_{k\sigma} \hat{n}_{k\bar{\sigma}} | \hat{c}_{k\sigma}^\dagger \rangle\rangle_\omega = \langle \hat{n}_{k\bar{\sigma}} \rangle + (\varepsilon_k - \mu + U) \langle\langle \hat{c}_{k\sigma} \hat{n}_{k\bar{\sigma}} | \hat{c}_{k\sigma}^\dagger \rangle\rangle_\omega$$

Since above equations are closed, we obtain

$$\langle\langle \hat{c}_{k\sigma} \hat{n}_{k\bar{\sigma}} | \hat{c}_{k\sigma}^\dagger \rangle\rangle_\omega = \frac{\langle \hat{n}_{k\bar{\sigma}} \rangle}{\omega - \varepsilon_k + \mu - U}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} G_\sigma(k, \omega) &= \frac{1 + \frac{U \langle \hat{n}_{k\bar{\sigma}} \rangle}{\omega - (\varepsilon_k - \mu + U)}}{\omega - (\varepsilon_k - \mu)} \\ &= \frac{1 - \langle \hat{n}_{k\bar{\sigma}} \rangle}{\omega - (\varepsilon_k - \mu)} + \frac{\langle \hat{n}_{k\bar{\sigma}} \rangle}{\omega - (\varepsilon_k - \mu + U)} \end{aligned}$$

which is just the wanted Eq. 4 in the main text.

Appendix B: Charge susceptibility of non-interacting electron

For self-content, we derive the non-interacting formula for charge susceptibility as follows. Firstly, we transformation $\chi_c(R_i, R_0, \tau)$ into momentum-energy space via

$$\chi_c^{(0)}(R_i, R_0, \tau) = \frac{1}{\beta N_s} \sum_{\Omega_n} \sum_q e^{iq(R_i - R_0) - i\Omega_n \tau} \chi_c^{(0)}(q, \Omega_n). \quad (\text{B1})$$




FIG. 12. δn_i for $U/t = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4$ with $V/t = 0.1$ and electron density is fixed to 0.4.

Then, it is straightforward to derive

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_c^{(0)}(q, \Omega_n) &= \int_0^\beta d\tau e^{i\Omega_n \tau} \sum_j e^{-iqR_j} \chi_c^{(0)}(R_j, 0, \tau) \\ &= \sum_{\sigma, \sigma'} \int_0^\beta d\tau e^{i\Omega_n \tau} \sum_j e^{-iqR_j} \\ &\quad \times \langle \hat{T}_\tau \hat{c}_{j\sigma}^\dagger(\tau) \hat{c}_{j\sigma}(\tau) \hat{c}_{0\sigma'}^\dagger \hat{c}_{0\sigma'} \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{N_s^2} \sum_{k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4} \sum_{\sigma, \sigma'} \int_0^\beta d\tau e^{i\Omega_n \tau} \sum_j e^{-iqR_j} \\ &\quad \times e^{-ik_1 R_j} e^{ik_2 R_j} \langle \hat{T}_\tau \hat{c}_{k_1 \sigma}^\dagger(\tau) \hat{c}_{k_2 \sigma}(\tau) \hat{c}_{k_3 \sigma'}^\dagger \hat{c}_{k_4 \sigma'} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Then, using the standard Wick theorem, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_c^{(0)}(q, \Omega_n) &= \frac{-1}{N_s} \sum_{k_1, \sigma} \int_0^\beta d\tau e^{i\Omega_n \tau} G_\sigma^{(0)}(k_1 + q, \tau) G_\sigma^{(0)}(k_1, -\tau) \\ &= \frac{-1}{N_s \beta} \sum_{k_1, \omega_n, \sigma} G_\sigma^{(0)}(k_1 + q, \omega_n + \Omega_n) G_\sigma^{(0)}(k_1, \omega_n) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B2})$$

Now, if we use the free electron Green's function $G_\sigma^{(0)}(k, \omega_n) = \frac{1}{i\omega_n - (\varepsilon_k - \mu)}$, it is found that

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_c^{(0)}(q, \Omega_n) &= \frac{-2}{N_s \beta} \sum_{k_1, \omega_n} \frac{1}{i\omega_n - (\varepsilon_k - \mu)} \\ &\quad \times \frac{1}{i\omega_n + i\Omega_n - (\varepsilon_{k+q} - \mu)} \\ &= \frac{2}{N_s} \sum_{k_1} \frac{f_F(\varepsilon_{k+q} - \mu) - f_F(\varepsilon_k - \mu)}{i\Omega_n - \varepsilon_{k+q} + \varepsilon_k}. \end{aligned}$$

which is the textbook result for non-interacting electron gas.

Appendix C: δn_i for electron density $n = 0.4$ and $n = 0.6$ from linear response theory

In the main text, we have given the FO results for electron density $n = 0.5$ in terms of linear response theory.




FIG. 13. δn_i for $U/t = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4$ with $V/t = 0.1$ and electron density is fixed to 0.6.

To see whether the physics depends on the choice of electron density, here the results for $n = 0.4$ and $n = 0.6$ are shown in Figs. 12 and 13. It is clearly that, just as the case of $n = 0.5$, there also exists FO for $n = 0.4$ and $n = 0.6$. Therefore, we may say that the NFL state indeed exhibits FO for generic electron filling.

* zhongy@lzu.edu.cn

- 1 Y. Hatsugai and M. Kohmoto, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **61**, 2056 (1992).
- 2 G. Baskaran, Mod. Phys. Lett. B **5**, 643 (1991).
- 3 Y. Hatsugai, M. Kohmoto, T. Koma and Y.-S. Wu, Phys. Rev. B **54**, 5358 (1996).
- 4 P. W. Phillips, C. Setty and S. Zhang, Phys. Rev. B **97**, 195102 (2018).
- 5 L. Yeo and P. W. Phillips, Phys. Rev. D **99**, 094030 (2019).
- 6 P. W. Phillips, L. Yeo and E. W. Huang, Nat. Phys. **16**, 1175 (2020).
- 7 K. Yang, Phys. Rev. B **103**, 024529 (2021).
- 8 H.-S. Zhu, Z. Li, Q. Han, and Z. D. Wang, Phys. Rev. B **103**, 024514 (2021).
- 9 J. Zhao, L. Yeo, E. W. Huang and P. W. Phillips, Phys. Rev. B **105**, 184509 (2022).
- 10 C. Setty, arXiv:2105.15205.
- 11 P. Mai, B. Feldman and P. W. Phillips, arXiv:2207.01638.
- 12 E. W. Huang, G. La Nave and P. W. Phillips, Nat. Phys. **18**, 511 (2022).
- 13 Y. Li, V. Mishra, Y. Zhou and F.-C. Zhang, New J. Phys. **24**, 103019 (2022).
- 14 C. Setty, Phys. Rev. B **101**, 184506 (2020).
- 15 C. Setty, Phys. Rev. B **103**, 014501 (2021).
- 16 Y. Zhong, Phys. Rev. B **106**, 155119 (2022).
- 17 R. Wang and K. Yang, arXiv:2301.04556.
- 18 Y. Zhong, arXiv:2301.09377.
- 19 V. Leeb and J. Knolle, arXiv:2301.08685.
- 20 J. Wang and Y.-F. Yang, arXiv:2301.12330.
- 21 C. Setty, S. Sury, L. Chen, F. Xie, H. Hu, S. Paschen, J. Cano and Q. Si, arXiv:2301.13870.
- 22 S. Sachdev and J. Ye, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 3339 (1993).
- 23 J. Maldacena and D. Stanford, Phys. Rev. D **94**, 106002 (2016).
- 24 D. Chowdhury, A. Georges, O. Parcollet and S. Sachdev, Rev. Mod. Phys. **94**, 035004 (2022).
- 25 A. Kitaev, Ann. Phys. **303**, 2 (2003).
- 26 A. Kitaev, Ann. Phys. **321**, 2 (2006).
- 27 C. Prosko, S.-P. Lee and J. Maciejko, Phys. Rev. B **96**, 205104 (2017).
- 28 Y. Zhong, Y.-F. Wang and H.-G. Luo, Phys. Rev. B **88**, 045109 (2013).
- 29 A. Smith, J. Knolle, D. L. Kovrizhin and R. Moessner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**, 266601 (2017).
- 30 T. Xiang and C. Wu, *D-wave superconductivity* (Cambridge University Press, 2022).
- 31 J. Friedel, Philos. Mag. **43**, 153 (1952).
- 32 R. Egger and H. Grabert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 3505 (1995).
- 33 A. Leclair, F. Lesage and H. Saleur, Phys. Rev. B **54**, 13597 (1996).
- 34 G. E. Simion and G. F. Giuliani, Phys. Rev. B **72**, 045127 (2005).
- 35 B. Chatterjee and K. Byczuk, J. Phys.: Conf. Ser. **592**, 012059 (2015).
- 36 S. R. White, I. Affleck and D. J. Scalapino, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 165122 (2002).
- 37 S. A. Söfing, M. Bortz, I. Schneider, A. Struck, M. Fleischhauer and S. Eggert, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 195114 (2009).
- 38 D. F. Mross and T. Senthil, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 041102(R) (2011).
- 39 Y. Zhou, K. Kanoda and T.-K. Ng, Rev. Mod. Phys. **89**, 025003 (2017).
- 40 S.-S. Lee and P. A. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 036403 (2005).
- 41 T. Senthil, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 035103 (2008).
- 42 T. Senthil, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 045109 (2008).
- 43 M. A. Metlitski and S. Sachdev, Phys. Rev. B **82**, 075127 (2010).
- 44 M. A. Metlitski and S. Sachdev, Phys. Rev. B **82**, 075128 (2010).
- 45 D. F. Mross, J. McGreevy, H. Liu and T. Senthil, Phys. Rev. B **82**, 045121 (2010).
- 46 T. Senthil, M. Vojta and S. Sachdev, Phys. Rev. B **69**, 035111 (2004).
- 47 I. Paul, C. Pépin and M. R. Norman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 026402 (2007).
- 48 Y. Zhong, K. Liu, Y.-Q. Wang and H.-G. Luo, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 115113 (2012).
- 49 P. Wölfle and E. Abrahams, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 041101(R) (2011).
- 50 E. Abrahams, J. Schmalian and Peter Wölfle, Phys. Rev. B **90**, 045105 (2014).
- 51 C. Vitoriano, L. B. Bejan, A. M. S. Macêdo and M. D. Coutinho-Filho, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 7941 (2000).
- 52 P. Nozières and D. Pines, *The Theory of Quantum Fluids* (CRC Press, 1966).
- 53 J. B. Ketterson, *The Physics of Solids* (Oxford University Press, 2016).

- ⁵⁴ M. Continentino, *Quantum Scaling in Many-Body Systems* (Cambridge University Press, 2017).
- ⁵⁵ J. Hubbard, *Proc. R. Soc. London, Ser.A* **276**, 238 (1963).
- ⁵⁶ P. Coleman, *Introduction to Many Body Physics* (Cambridge University Press, 2015).
- ⁵⁷ P. Lederer and M. J. Rozenberg, *EPL* **81**, 67002 (2008).
- ⁵⁸ E. A. Nowadnick, B. Moritz and T. P. Devereaux, *Phys. Rev. B* **86**, 134509 (2012).
- ⁵⁹ B. Chatterjee, J. Skolimowski, K. Makuch and K. Byczuk, *Phys. Rev. B* **100**, 115118 (2019).
- ⁶⁰ I. Dzyaloshinskii, *Phys. Rev. B* **68**, 085113 (2003)
- ⁶¹ F. S. Nogueira and E. V. Anda, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. B* **10**, 3705 (1996).
- ⁶² D. A. Abanin, E. Altman, I. Bloch and M. Serbyn, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **91**, 021001 (2019).
- ⁶³ A. C. Hewson, *The Kondo Problem to Heavy Fermion* (Cambridge University Press, 1993).
- ⁶⁴ P. Contucci and C. Giardinà, *Perspectives on Spin Glasses* (Cambridge University Press, 2013).
- ⁶⁵ R. Bulla, T. A. Costi and T. Pruschke, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **80**, 395 (2008).
- ⁶⁶ K. Yosida, *Phys. Rev.* **147**, 223 (1966).
- ⁶⁷ T. M. Rice, K. Y. Yang and F.C. Zhang, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **75**, 016502 (2012).
- ⁶⁸ W.-W. Yang, Q. Chen, H.-G. Luo and Y. Zhong, *Phys. Rev. B* **106**, 195117 (2022).
- ⁶⁹ W.-W. Yang, J. Zhao, H.-G. Luo and Y. Zhong, *Phys. Rev. B* **100**, 045148 (2019).
- ⁷⁰ W.-W. Yang, Y.-X. Li, Y. Zhong and H.-G. Luo, *Phys. Rev. B* **104**, 165146 (2021).