

Boundary multifractality in the spin quantum Hall symmetry class with interaction

S. S. Babkin¹ and I. S. Burmistrov^{2,3}

¹*Institute of Science and Technology, Am Campus 1 3400 Klosterneuburg, Austria*

²*L. D. Landau Institute for Theoretical Physics, acad. Semenova av. 1-a, 142432 Chernogolovka, Russia*

³*Laboratory for Condensed Matter Physics, HSE University, 101000 Moscow, Russia*

(Dated: September 1, 2023)

Generalized multifractality characterizes system size dependence of pure scaling local observables at Anderson transitions in all ten symmetry classes of disordered systems. Recently, the concept of generalized multifractality has been extended to boundaries of critical disordered noninteracting systems. Here we study the generalized boundary multifractality in the presence of electron-electron interaction, focusing on the spin quantum Hall symmetry class (class C). Employing the two-loop renormalization group analysis within Finkel'stein nonlinear sigma model we compute the anomalous dimensions of the pure scaling operators located at the boundary of the system. We find that generalized boundary multifractal exponents are twice larger than their bulk counterparts. Exact symmetry relations between generalized boundary multifractal exponents in the case of noninteracting systems are explicitly broken by the interaction.

I. INTRODUCTION

A fascinating example of a quantum phase transition in a free fermion system is Anderson transition [1]. This transition is controlled by disorder and separates metallic and insulating phases. Additional boost to studies of Anderson transition is provided by the fact that some Anderson transitions occur between distinct topological (insulating) phases, e.g. integer quantum Hall plateau-plateau transitions. An intriguing feature of Anderson transition is strong mesoscopic fluctuations of electron wave functions at criticality [2, 3]. Consequently, the disorder averaged moments of the local density of states (LDoS) demonstrate *pure* power-law scaling with the system size, $\langle \rho^q \rangle \sim L^{-x_{(q)}}$. Here values of the *multifractal* exponents $x_{(q)}$ depend on a symmetry class of considered random Hamiltonian (see Refs. [4, 5] for a review).

There are much more pure scaling observables in addition to the moments of LDoS [6]. They can be expressed in terms of disorder averages of specific combinations of wave functions [7–10]. The corresponding set of multifractal exponents x_λ , termed as *generalized multifractality*, is unique characteristic of Anderson transition in each symmetry class. Exponents x_λ are related by symmetry relations specific for each symmetry class [7, 11, 12].

Recently, it has been established that statistics of wave functions at surface (s) of a system undergoing bulk Anderson transition is different from the statistics in the bulk [13–17]. In particular, the scaling of the LDoS moments at the boundary is given as $\langle \rho^q(\mathbf{r} \in s) \rangle \sim L^{-x_{(q)}^{(s)}}$, with $x_{(q)}^{(s)} \neq x_{(q)}$. In Ref. [18] the theory of generalized multifractality has been extended to boundaries of critical systems.

The picture of generalized multifractality at Anderson transitions has recently been fully supported by numerics in symmetry classes A, C, AIII, AII, D, and DIII [8–10, 19, 20]. However, multifractality is of relevance for experiments as well. Light waves spreading in an array of dielectric nanoneedles demonstrated multifractal

behavior in experiments reported in Ref. [21]. Multifractal behavior of ultrasound waves was observed while they propagated through a system of randomly packed Al beads [22]. In the experiment [23] the electron LDoS was measured by scanning tunneling microscopy on a surface of diluted magnetic semiconductor $\text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{Mn}_x\text{As}$. While it was tuned through bulk Anderson transition multifractal signatures in LDoS has been measured. In the experiment on $\text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{Mn}_x\text{As}$, the surface multifractality was presumably observed. Multifractal behavior of LDoS amplitude has been recently measured in weakly disordered superconducting state in the stripped incommensurate phase of monolayer Pb/Si(111) [24].

Multifractality is responsible for many nontrivial physical effects. It was shown [25–32] that multifractal correlations effectively increase electron-electron attraction and, thus, lead to strong enhancement of superconducting transition temperature and the superconducting gap at zero temperature. Moreover, it was found that multifractality is responsible for log-normal distribution of the superconducting order parameter [26, 33, 34] and LDoS [30, 31, 35] in dirty superconducting films. Multifractal correlations result in instabilities of surface states in topological superconductors [36, 37]. Multifractal behavior of LDoS causes strong mesoscopic fluctuations of the Kondo temperature [38–40]. Multifractality affects electron-phonon coupling making cooling of electrons more efficient [41]. Anderson orthogonality catastrophe is also affected by multifractal properties of wave functions [42]. Multifractality in LDoS enhances depairing effect of magnetic impurities on superconducting state in dirty films [43] and the superconducting LDoS around Yu-Shiba-Rusinov states [44].

Recently, it has been suggested that multifractality can serve as a sensitive instrument to test critical theories proposed to describe Anderson transitions. Although for each of ten Altland–Zirnbauer symmetry classes effective, long-wave description in terms of a nonlinear sigma model (NL σ M) is known (see Ref. [5] for a review), Anderson transition occurs typically in strong coupling.

Thus Anderson transition criticality is beyond standard treatment of NL σ M. A prime example of such a situation is the integer quantum Hall plateau transition for which the Wess–Zumino–Novikov–Witten models were conjectured to be an ultimate conformal critical theory [45–50]. It turns out that assumptions of the local conformal invariance and Abelian fusion rules result in parabolic form¹ of the generalized multifractal exponents x_λ with a single free parameter only [19, 52]. However, available numerical computations of multifractal spectrum for the integer quantum Hall plateau transitions demonstrate significant deviations from the exact parabolicity [16, 17, 19]. This makes the theoretical suggestions of the Wess–Zumino–Novikov–Witten models as critical theories for the integer quantum Hall transition to be highly questionable.

Even more dramatic situation is in superconducting cousin of the integer quantum Hall effect — the spin quantum Hall effect (class C) [53, 54]. An advantage of the spin quantum Hall transition in $d=2$, is that an infinite subset of generalized multifractal exponents is known analytically from exact mapping to the percolation problem [8, 15, 55–58]. The rigorous analytical results serve as a benchmark against numerical computations. Although numerical data for the generalized multifractal spectrum reproduce exact analytical results, they demonstrate clear evidence for a violation of parabolicity [8–10, 19, 20, 57, 59]. Similarly, parabolicity is expected to hold for the surface generalized multifractal exponents in the presence of the local conformal invariance and the abelian fusion. Again, for the class C numerics does not support parabolicity of boundary multifractal exponents but coincides, simultaneously, with exact analytical values of exponents [18]. These results prove a lack of the local conformal invariance at the spin quantum Hall transition in $d=2$.

Electron-electron interaction, being typically, a relevant perturbation modifies the scaling properties of observables at Anderson (or in that case the so-called Mott–Anderson) transitions (see Refs. [60, 61] for a review). Surprisingly, the generalized multifractality exists even in the presence of interaction, i.e. at Mott-Anderson criticality [62–65]. In this case the pure scaling operators can be formulated as proper correlations of single particle Green’s functions. In particular, the moments of LDoS remain pure scaling operators. Although interaction does not change the form of the pure scaling operators (except straightforward generalization to incorporate a set of Matsubara frequencies) it affects the generalized multifractal exponents. In particular, it breaks the symmetry relations between different multifractal exponents.

In this paper we develop the theory of the generalized boundary multifractality for the spin quantum Hall

symmetry class in the presence of electron-electron interaction. Using Finkel’stein NL σ M for class C we compute the anomalous dimensions of the pure scaling derivative-less local operators situated near the boundary in the two-loop renormalization group approximation. Surprisingly, within two-loop approximation we find that the anomalous dimensions of pure scaling operators at the boundary and in the bulk differs by a factor 2. Also interaction breaks the symmetry relations between the generalized surface multifractal exponents in the same way as for the bulk ones.

Throughout the paper we use terms ‘surface’ and ‘boundary’ interchangeably, as they both have been used in the previous literature on multifractality. Also we note that in d -dimensions, the surface is understood as a $(d-1)$ -dimensional boundary.

The outline of the paper is as follows. In Sec. II we remind formalism of Finkel’stein NL σ M for class C. We remind the results for generalized bulk multifractality in the presence of interaction (Sec. III). The original results for generalized surface multifractality in the presence of interaction are presented in Sec. IV. We end the paper with discussions and conclusions in Sec. V. The details of computations are given in Appendix.

II. FINKEL’SSTEIN NL σ M FOR CLASS C

A. NL σ M action

We start from a brief reminder of the Finkel’stein NL σ M for the class C (for more details see Ref. [65]). The grand canonical partition function is given as

$$Z = \int D[Q] \exp S, \quad S = S_0 + S_{\text{int}}, \quad (1)$$

where S_0 and S_{int} are free and interacting parts of the action. We note that the action involves also the topological term similar to the class A. However, we omit the topological term in this paper since we focus on the perturbative treatment of the model. S_0 and S_{int} are as follows

$$S_0 = -\frac{g}{16} \int_{\mathbf{r}} \text{Tr}(\nabla Q)^2 + Z_\omega \int_{\mathbf{r}} \text{Tr} \varepsilon Q, \quad (2a)$$

$$S_{\text{int}} = -\frac{\pi T \Gamma_t}{4} \sum_{\alpha, n} \int_{\mathbf{r}} \text{Tr}(I_n^\alpha \mathbf{s} Q) \text{Tr}(I_{-n}^\alpha \mathbf{s} Q), \quad (2b)$$

where $\int_{\mathbf{r}} \equiv \int d^d \mathbf{r}$ and T stands for temperature. The field variable Q is a Hermitian matrix, $Q^\dagger = Q$, acting in the 2×2 spin space, in the $N_r \times N_r$ replica space, and in the $2N_m \times 2N_m$ space of the Matsubara fermionic energies, $\varepsilon_n = \pi T(2n+1)$. The matrix Q satisfies the nonlinear local constraint

$$Q^2(\mathbf{r}) = 1 \quad (3)$$

¹ We note that parabolicity of x_λ arises in any dimensionality $d \geq 2$ in the case of conformal invariance [51].

and obeys the Bogolubov – de Gennes symmetry relation

$$Q = -\bar{Q}, \quad \bar{Q} = s_2 L_0 Q^\top L_0 s_2. \quad (4)$$

Here superscript \top denotes the matrix transposition operation. Several matrices introduced above are given as follows

$$\begin{aligned} (I_k^\gamma)^{\alpha\beta} &= \delta_{n-m,k} \delta^{\alpha\beta} \delta^{\alpha\gamma} s_0, & \hat{\varepsilon}_{nm}^{\alpha\beta} &= \varepsilon_n \delta_{nm} \delta^{\alpha\beta} s_0, \\ (L_0)^{\alpha\beta} &= \delta_{\varepsilon_n, -\varepsilon_m} \delta^{\alpha\beta} s_0, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where s_0 is the 2×2 identity matrix in the spin space. The Latin indices represent Matsubara energies whereas the Greek indices correspond to replica space. The vector $\mathbf{s} = \{s_1, s_2, s_3\}$ is the vector of three nontrivial Pauli matrices

$$s_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad s_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad s_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (6)$$

Nonlinear constraint (3) can be resolved by

$$Q = \mathbf{T}^{-1} \Lambda \mathbf{T}, \quad \Lambda_{nm}^{\alpha\beta} = \text{sgn } \varepsilon_n \delta_{nm} \delta^{\alpha\beta} s_0 \quad (7)$$

Here the rotation \mathbf{T} is a unitary matrix satisfying

$$\mathbf{T}^{-1} = \mathbf{T}^\dagger, \quad (\mathbf{T}^{-1})^\top L_0 s_2 = s_2 L_0 \mathbf{T}. \quad (8)$$

Parametrization (7) and condition (8) fix the target space of the NL σ M as $Q \in \text{Sp}(2N)/\text{U}(N)$ where $N=2N_r N_m$. We note that one needs to take the limits $N_m \rightarrow \infty$ and $N_r \rightarrow 0$.

The NL σ M action (1) involves a bare dimensionless spin conductance g , a bare exchange interaction Γ_t , and a parameter Z_ω , which is responsible for frequency renormalization.

As we shall see below, in order to extract singular infrared behavior within the NL σ M action it is convenient to add the following regulator into the action (1):

$$S_h = \frac{gh^2}{8} \int_{\mathbf{r}} \text{Tr } \Lambda Q. \quad (9)$$

We note that the NL σ M action (2a), (2b), and (9) can be reduced to the NL σ M for the class A by breaking spin rotation symmetry from SU(2) down to U(1) such that the Q matrix in the spin space acquires the diagonal form

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} Q_\uparrow & 0 \\ 0 & Q_\downarrow \end{pmatrix}, \quad Q_\downarrow = -L_0 Q_\uparrow^\top L_0. \quad (10)$$

B. Perturbation theory

In order to proceed we need to develop perturbation theory in $1/g \ll 1$. Since in this work we are interested in boundary multifractality, we consider a 2D sample with the boundary at $x = 0$ (see Fig. 1). In what follows, we will employ dimensional regularization method such




FIG. 1. Sketch of the system with a boundary perpendicular to the x axis and situated at $x=0$.

that we will work in $d=2+\epsilon$ dimension. We parametrize a d -dimensional coordinate vector as $\mathbf{r} = \{x, y_1, \dots, y_{d-1}\}$.

Also we will use the square-root parametrization of the Q matrix:

$$Q = W + \Lambda \sqrt{1 - W^2}, \quad W = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & w \\ w^\dagger & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (11)$$

where we adopt the following notations: $W_{n_1 n_2} = w_{n_1 n_2}$ and $W_{n_2 n_1} = w_{n_2 n_1}^\dagger$ with $\varepsilon_{n_1} > 0$ and $\varepsilon_{n_2} < 0$. Making expansion $w = \sum_{j=0}^3 w_j s_j$, we find that the elements of w_j satisfy the symmetry relations (cf. Eq. (4))

$$(w_j)_{n_1 n_2}^{\alpha\beta} = v_j (w_j)_{-n_2, -n_1}^{\beta\alpha}. \quad (12)$$

where $v_j = -\text{tr}(s_j s_2 s_j^\top s_2)/2 = \{-1, 1, 1, 1\}$.

From the second order expansion of Eq. (1) in W , we find the propagators of Gaussian theory:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (w_j)_{n_1 n_2}^{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{r}) (w_j^\dagger)_{n_4 n_3}^{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{r}') \rangle &= \frac{2}{g} \left[\left(\delta^{\alpha\nu} \delta^{\beta\mu} \delta_{n_1 n_3} \delta_{n_2 n_4} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + v_j \delta^{\alpha\mu} \delta^{\beta\nu} \delta_{n_1, -n_4} \delta_{n_2, -n_3} \right) \hat{D}(i\omega_{n_{12}}; \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{4\pi T \gamma}{D} (1 - \delta_{j0}) \delta^{\alpha\nu} \delta^{\beta\mu} \delta^{\alpha\beta} \delta_{n_{12}, n_{34}} \widehat{\mathcal{D}}^t(i\omega_{n_{12}}; \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \right], \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where we denote $\omega_{n_{12}} = \varepsilon_{n_1} - \varepsilon_{n_2}$ and $n_{12} = n_1 - n_2$. Next, $D = g/(4Z_\omega)$ and $\gamma = \Gamma_t/Z_\omega$ are a bare diffusion coefficient and a dimensionless interaction strength, respectively. Diffuson and diffuson dressed by interaction via ladder resummation are given as

$$\hat{D}(i\omega_{n_{12}}; \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = \sum_{s=\pm} \mathcal{D}(i\omega_{n_{12}}; x - sx', \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}'), \quad (14a)$$

$$\hat{D}^t(i\omega_{n_{12}}; \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = \sum_{s=\pm} \mathcal{D}^t(i\omega_{n_{12}}; x - sx', \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}'), \quad (14b)$$

where $\mathbf{y} = \{y_1, \dots, y_{d-1}\}$. Here $\mathcal{D}(i\omega_n; x, \mathbf{y})$ and $\mathcal{D}^t(i\omega_n; x, \mathbf{y})$ correspond to the diffusons in an infinite sample ($\int_{\mathbf{q}} \equiv \int d^d \mathbf{q} / (2\pi)^d$),

$$\mathcal{D}^t(i\omega_n; x, \mathbf{y}) = \int_{\mathbf{q}} \mathcal{D}_q^t(i\omega_n) e^{iq_x x + i\mathbf{q} \parallel \mathbf{y}} \quad (15)$$

with the standard momentum representation

$$\mathcal{D}_q(i\omega_n) = \left[q^2 + h^2 + \omega_n/D \right]^{-1}, \quad (16a)$$

$$\mathcal{D}_q^t(i\omega_n) = \left[q^2 + h^2 + (1 + \gamma)\omega_n/D \right]^{-1}. \quad (16b)$$

Also we introduced the following notation

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathcal{D}}^t(i\omega; \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}_1) &= \int' dx_2 \int d^{d-1} \mathbf{y}_2 \widehat{\mathcal{D}}(i\omega; \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}_2) \widehat{\mathcal{D}}^t(i\omega; \mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_1) \\ &= \int_{\mathbf{q}} \mathcal{D}_q^t(i\omega) \sum_{s=\pm} e^{iq_x(x-sx_1) + i\mathbf{q} \parallel (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}_1)}. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Here the ‘prime’ sign on the integral indicates that we integrate over $x_2 > 0$. Also we introduced the short-hand notation: $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}_q^t(i\omega_n) \equiv \mathcal{D}_q(i\omega_n) \mathcal{D}_q^t(i\omega_n)$.

NL σ M action, see Eqs. (2a), (2b), and (9), is subjected to renormalization. Within one-loop order (the lowest order in $t = 1/(\pi g)$), the renormalized parameters (denotes by ‘prime’ signs) are given as (for system without the boundary)

$$\begin{aligned} h'^2 &= \frac{gh^2 Z}{g'} = h^2 \left[1 - \frac{bth^\epsilon}{\epsilon} \right], & g' &= g \left[1 + \frac{a_1 th^\epsilon}{\epsilon} \right], \\ \frac{Z'_\omega}{Z_\omega} &= \frac{\Gamma'_t}{\Gamma_t} = 1 + (1 - 3\gamma) \frac{th^\epsilon}{\epsilon}, \\ a_1 &= v/2 + 6f(\gamma), & b &= 3 \ln(1 + \gamma) + 6f(\gamma). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Here we introduced $v = \sum_{j=0}^3 v_j \equiv 2$. The above results can be rewritten in the form of the one-loop renormalization group equations (with usage of the minimal subtraction scheme [66]),

$$\frac{dt}{d\ell} = -\epsilon t + [v/2 + 6f(\gamma)] t^2 + O(t^3), \quad (19a)$$

$$\frac{d\gamma}{d\ell} = 0 + O(t^2), \quad (19b)$$

$$\frac{d \ln Z_\omega}{d\ell} = -(v/2 - 3\gamma)t + O(t^2), \quad (19c)$$

$$\frac{d \ln Z}{d\ell} = -[v/2 - 3 \ln(1 + \gamma)]t + O(t^2). \quad (19d)$$

Here $\ell = \ln 1/h'$ stands for the logarithm of the infrared length scale which is just a system size at $T=0$. At finite temperature the infrared scale is set by the temperature length $\sim \sqrt{D/T}$. We note that Eqs. (19) have been derived in Refs.[65, 67–70] by various techniques.

III. GENERALIZED BULK MULTIFRACTALITY

We start from reminder of generalized multifractality in the bulk for class C reported in Ref. [65]. An operator

without derivatives which involves the number q of Q fields can be constructed as follows [64, 65]. We introduce the quantity

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_q(E_1, \dots, E_q) &= \frac{1}{4q} \sum_{p_1, \dots, p_q = \pm} \left(\prod_{j=1}^q p_j \right) \\ &\times \mathcal{P}_q^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_q; p_1, \dots, p_q}(E_1, \dots, E_q), \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

depending on the set $\{E_1, \dots, E_q\}$ of real energies. The correlation function $\mathcal{P}_q^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_q; p_1, \dots, p_q}(E_1, \dots, E_q)$ can be obtained from its Matsubara counterpart $P_q^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_q}(i\varepsilon_{n_1}, \dots, i\varepsilon_{n_q})$ by the analytic continuation to the real frequencies: $\varepsilon_{n_j} \rightarrow E_j + ip_j 0^+$. The corresponding Matsubara correlation function is given as

$$\begin{aligned} P_q^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_q}(i\varepsilon_{n_1}, \dots, i\varepsilon_{n_q}) &= \sum_{\{k_1, \dots, k_s\}} \mu_{k_1, \dots, k_s} \langle R_{k_1, \dots, k_s} \rangle, \\ R_{k_1, \dots, k_s} &= \prod_{r=k_1}^{k_s} \text{tr} Q_{n_{j_1} n_{j_2}}^{\alpha_{j_1} \alpha_{j_2}} Q_{n_{j_2} n_{j_3}}^{\alpha_{j_2} \alpha_{j_3}} \dots Q_{n_{j_r} n_{j_1}}^{\alpha_{j_r} \alpha_{j_1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

The summation in the right hand side of Eq. (21) is performed over all partitions² of the integer number q . We note that all replica indices in Eq. (20) are different: $\alpha_j \neq \alpha_k$ if $j \neq k$ for $j, k = 1, \dots, q$. One coefficient among the set $\{\mu_{k_1, \dots, k_s}\}$ can be chosen arbitrary. We adopt the following convention: $\mu_{1, 1, \dots, 1} = 1$. We mention that the following simplified operator

$$\begin{aligned} K_q &= \frac{1}{4q} \sum_{p_k = \pm} \left(\prod_{j=1}^q p_j \lim_{n_j \rightarrow 0} \right) \\ &\times P_q^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_q}(ip_1 |\varepsilon_{n_1}|, \dots, ip_q |\varepsilon_{n_q}|) \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

has the same renormalization as $\mathcal{K}_q(E_1, \dots, E_q)$. Therefore, in what follows we will work with K_q instead of \mathcal{K}_q .

In the absence of interaction, $\gamma=0$, the NL σ M action reduces to Eq. (2b). Then one can project Q matrix to the 2×2 subspace of a given positive and a given negative Matsubara frequencies³. The projection corresponds to reduction of $\text{Sp}(2N)$ to $\text{Sp}(4N_r)$. The effective action becomes invariant under rotations $Q \rightarrow T^{-1} Q T$ with $T \in \text{U}(2N_r)$. This allows one to average operators \mathcal{K}_q over $\text{U}(2N_r)$ rotations. The resulting rotationally invariant operators can be classified with respect to the irreducible representations of $\text{Sp}(2N)$. Each irreducible representation contains single rotationally invariant pure

² The partitions is a set of positive integer numbers $\{k_1, \dots, k_s\}$ which satisfy the following conditions: $k_1 + k_2 + \dots + k_s = q$ and $k_1 \geq k_2 \geq \dots \geq k_s > 0$.

³ It is possible since the Matsubara indices of the Q matrix are not mixed in the absence of interaction (the energy of diffusive modes conserves).

scaling operator [6, 7, 19]. The corresponding eigenoperators can uniquely be characterized by the Young tableau $\lambda=(k_1, \dots, k_s)$ (with $|\lambda|=\sum_{j=1}^s k_j=q$).

Although interaction breaks beautiful mathematical structure of NL σ M manifold, surprisingly, it does not spoil the structure of non-U($2N_r N_m$)-invariant eigenoperators \mathcal{K}_λ [62–65]. The coefficients μ_{k_1, \dots, k_s} for $|\lambda|=2, 3, 4$ are listed in Table I. Not surprisingly, the anomalous dimension of \mathcal{K}_λ is changed by the interaction. The renormalized eigenoperator can be written as

$$\mathcal{K}_\lambda = Z^q M_\lambda \mathcal{K}_\lambda[\Lambda], \quad (23)$$

where the factor Z describing renormalization of the local density of states is governed by the following RG equation

$$\eta_{(1)} = -\frac{d \ln Z}{d\ell} = [1 - 3 \ln(1 + \gamma)]t + O(t^2). \quad (24)$$

We note that in the presence of interaction the expression for $\eta_{(1)}$ is known upto the one-loop approximation only. The quantity M_λ determines the anomalous dimension

$$\eta_\lambda = -\frac{d \ln M_\lambda}{d\ell} = \mu_{2,1, \dots, 1} t [1 + 3c(\gamma)t] + O(t^3), \quad (25)$$

where $\mu_{2,1, \dots, 1}$ is a coefficient in expansion of the eigenoperator in series in the basis operators R_{k_1, \dots, k_s} , see Eq. (21). For the eigenoperator characterized by the Young tableau $\lambda=(k_1, \dots, k_s)$ this coefficient is given as [19] (see Table I for $|\lambda|=2, 3, 4$)

$$\mu_{2,1, \dots, 1} = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^s k_j (c_j + 2 + k_j), \quad c_j = 1 - 4j. \quad (26)$$

The function $c(\gamma)$ contains information about interaction and is given as [62–65]

$$c(\gamma) = 2 + \frac{1 + \gamma}{2\gamma} \ln^2(1 + \gamma) + \frac{2 + \gamma}{\gamma} \text{li}_2(-\gamma). \quad (27)$$

The anomalous dimensions η_λ determine the scaling with the system size L of the eigen operators at the fixed point,

$$\mathcal{K}_\lambda \sim L^{-x_\lambda}, \quad x_\lambda = |\lambda|x_{(1)} + \Delta_\lambda. \quad (28)$$

Here the exponent $x_{(1)}$ coincides with the magnitude of $\eta_{(1)}$ at the fixed point, $x_{(1)}=\eta_{(1)}^*$. Similarly, the exponent Δ_λ is equal to the anomalous dimension of M_λ at the fixed point, $\Delta_\lambda=\eta_\lambda$.

Next we discuss how Eqs. (24) and (25) are modified for the local eigenoperators situated near the boundary.

IV. GENERALIZED SURFACE MULTIFRACTALITY

In this section we compute anomalous dimensions of the RG eigenoperators without derivatives near the boundary.

TABLE I. The coefficients μ_{k_1, \dots, k_s} for eigenoperators with $q = 2, 3, 4$.

q = 2	$\mu_{1,1}$	μ_2		
(2)	1	-1		
(1,1)	1	2		
q = 3	$\mu_{1,1,1}$	$\mu_{2,1}$	μ_3	
(3)	1	-3	2	
(2,1)	1	1	-2	
(1,1,1)	1	6	8	
q = 4	$\mu_{1,1,1,1}$	$\mu_{2,1,1}$	$\mu_{3,1}$	$\mu_{2,2}$ μ_4
(4)	1	-6	8	3 -6
(3,1)	1	-1	-2	-2 4
(2,2)	1	2	-8	7 -2
(2,1,1)	1	5	4	-2 -8
(1,1,1,1)	1	12	32	12 48

A. Operator with a single Q matrix

We start analysis from the local eigenoperator with a single Q matrix,

$$P_1^\alpha(i\varepsilon_n) = \text{tr}\langle Q_{nn}^{\alpha\alpha} \rangle. \quad (29)$$

Physically, it corresponds to the average local density of states near the boundary. Substituting the expansion $Q \simeq \Lambda + W - \Lambda W^2/2$, we find that

$$P_1^\alpha(i\varepsilon_n) = 2Z^{(s)}(i\varepsilon_n) \text{sgn } \varepsilon_n, \quad (30)$$

where

$$Z^{(s)}(i\varepsilon_n) = 1 - \frac{\nu}{g} \hat{\mathcal{D}}(2i|\varepsilon_n|; \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}) + \frac{12\pi T\gamma}{gD} \sum_{\omega_m > |\varepsilon_n|} \widehat{\mathcal{D}}^t(i\omega_m; \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}). \quad (31)$$

Assuming that the point \mathbf{r} is close to the boundary at $x = 0$, we find that

$$\hat{\mathcal{D}}(i\omega_n; \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}) \simeq 2 \int_q \mathcal{D}_q(i\omega_n), \quad (32a)$$

$$\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^t(i\omega_n; \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}) \simeq 2 \int_q \mathcal{D}_q^t(i\omega_n). \quad (32b)$$

Therefore, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_{(1)} &= Z^{(s)} \mathcal{K}_{(1)}[\Lambda], \quad Z^{(s)} = 1 + \left(\frac{\nu}{2} - 3 \ln(1 + \gamma) \right) \frac{2th^\epsilon}{\epsilon} \\ &= 1 + (\nu/2 - 3 \ln(1 + \gamma)) 2th'^\epsilon / \epsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Applying the minimal subtraction scheme, we deduce the anomalous dimension of the operator $\mathcal{K}_{(1)}$,

$$\eta_{(1)}^{(s)} = -\frac{d \ln Z^{(s)}}{d\ell} = 2t [1 - 3 \ln(1 + \gamma)] + O(t^2). \quad (34)$$

We note that similar to the bulk anomalous dimension $\eta_{(1)}$ the interaction affects the anomalous dimension of

$Z^{(s)}$ already in the one-loop approximation. The effect of the boundary is a factor 2 in front of t in the right hand side of Eq. (34), cf. Eq. (24). Since the two-loop expression for the bulk anomalous dimension $\eta_{(1)}$ is not known at the moment, in this work we restrict our computation of the surface anomalous dimension $\eta_{(1)}^{(s)}$ to the one-loop order only. As we shall see below, cf. Sec. IV B 3, one-loop renormalization of $Z^{(s)}$ will be enough in order to determine surface anomalous dimensions of eigenoperators with $q \geq 2$ within two-loop approximation.

B. Local eigenoperators with two Q matrices

1. One-loop renormalization

As known there are two local eigenoperators with two Q matrices denoted as $\mathcal{K}_{(2)}$ and $\mathcal{K}_{(1,1)}$. It will be convenient to consider the irreducible part of the corresponding correlation function,

$$P_2^{\alpha\beta;(\text{irr})}(i\varepsilon_n, i\varepsilon_m) = \langle\langle \text{tr} Q_{nn}^{\alpha\alpha} \text{tr} Q_{mm}^{\beta\beta} \rangle\rangle + \mu_2 \langle\text{tr} Q_{nm}^{\alpha\beta} Q_{mn}^{\beta\alpha}\rangle. \quad (35)$$

Here $\mu_2 = -1$ and 2 corresponds to the operator $\mathcal{K}_{(2)}$ and $\mathcal{K}_{(1,1)}$, respectively. We note that the full correlation function can be restored as follows

$$P_2^{\alpha\beta}(i\varepsilon_n, i\varepsilon_m) = (2Z^{(s)})^2 \text{sgn} \varepsilon_n \text{sgn} \varepsilon_m + P_2^{\alpha\beta;(\text{irr})}(i\varepsilon_n, i\varepsilon_m). \quad (36)$$

After expansion of Q to the first order in W , the one-loop contribution becomes

$$P_{2,1}^{\alpha\beta;(\text{irr})}(i\varepsilon_n, i\varepsilon_m) = \mu_2 \langle\text{tr} W_{nm}^{\alpha\beta} W_{mn}^{\beta\alpha}\rangle = \frac{16\mu_2}{g} \times \frac{1 - \text{sgn} \varepsilon_n \text{sgn} \varepsilon_m}{2} \hat{\mathcal{D}}(i|\varepsilon_n| + i|\varepsilon_m|; \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}). \quad (37)$$

Neglecting the energy dependence in the diffusive propagators and using Eq. (32a), we find the following one-loop result for the irreducible part of the operator K_2 ,

$$K_{2,1}^{(\text{irr})} = 2t\mu_2 h^\varepsilon / \varepsilon. \quad (38)$$

We note the same additional factor 2 as in the one-loop expression for $Z^{(s)}$.

2. Two-loop renormalization

Next expanding Q to the second order in W , we obtain the two-loop contribution as

$$P_{2,2}^{\alpha\beta;(\text{irr})} = \frac{1}{4} \text{sgn} \varepsilon_n \text{sgn} \varepsilon_m \langle\langle \text{tr}(W^2)_{nn}^{\alpha\alpha} \text{tr}(W^2)_{mm}^{\beta\beta} \rangle\rangle + \mu_2 \frac{1 + \text{sgn} \varepsilon_n \text{sgn} \varepsilon_m}{8} \langle\text{tr}(W^2)_{nm}^{\alpha\beta} (W^2)_{mn}^{\beta\alpha}\rangle + \mu_2 \frac{1 - \text{sgn} \varepsilon_n \text{sgn} \varepsilon_m}{2} \langle\langle \text{tr} W_{nm}^{\alpha\beta} W_{mn}^{\beta\alpha} \left[\begin{array}{c} S_0^{(4)} + S_{\text{int}}^{(4)} \\ + \frac{1}{2} (S_{\text{int}}^{(3)})^2 \end{array} \right] \rangle\rangle. \quad (39)$$

In order to compute (39), we need to calculate several contractions of W matrices. At first, using Eq. (13), we find

$$\langle\langle \text{tr}(W^2)_{nn}^{\alpha\alpha} \text{tr}(W^2)_{mm}^{\beta\beta} \rangle\rangle = \frac{64}{g^2} \left(\hat{\mathcal{D}}(i|\varepsilon_n| + i|\varepsilon_m|; \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}) \right)^2 \simeq \frac{64}{g^2} \left(2 \int_q \mathcal{D}_q(i|\varepsilon_n| + i|\varepsilon_m|) \right)^2 \rightarrow 16 \frac{(2t)^2 h^{2\varepsilon}}{\varepsilon^2}. \quad (40)$$

In the last line we use Eq. (32a) and neglect the energy dependence in the propagators.

Next, we proceed as follows

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle\text{tr}(W^2)_{nm}^{\alpha\beta} (W^2)_{mn}^{\beta\alpha}\rangle \\ &= -3 \frac{2^7 \pi T \gamma}{g^2 D} \sum_{\varepsilon_k > 0} \hat{\mathcal{D}}(i|\varepsilon_m| + i\varepsilon_k; \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}) \widehat{\mathcal{D}}^t(i|\varepsilon_n| + i\varepsilon_k; \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}) \\ &+ \frac{32\nu}{g^2} \hat{\mathcal{D}}(2i|\varepsilon_n|; \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}) \hat{\mathcal{D}}(i|\varepsilon_n| + i|\varepsilon_m|; \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}) + (n \leftrightarrow m) \\ &\simeq -3 \frac{2^9 \pi T \gamma}{g^2 D} \sum_{\varepsilon_k > 0} \int_{qp} \mathcal{D}_q(i|\varepsilon_m| + i\varepsilon_k) \mathcal{D}_p^t(i|\varepsilon_n| + i\varepsilon_k) \\ &+ \frac{32\nu}{g^2} 4 \int_{qp} \mathcal{D}_q(2i|\varepsilon_n|) \mathcal{D}_p(i|\varepsilon_n| + i|\varepsilon_m|) + (n \leftrightarrow m) \\ &\rightarrow 16\nu \frac{(2t)^2 h^{2\varepsilon}}{\varepsilon^2} - 48 \frac{(2t)^2 h^{2\varepsilon}}{\varepsilon^2} \left[\ln(1+\gamma) - \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \ln^2(1+\gamma) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Here we use Eqs. (32a) and (32b). We refer a reader to Ref. [63] for details on computation of integrals over momenta and frequency involved in Eq. (41).

Next we have to introduce the following non-Gaussian terms stemming from the expansion of Q matrix in powers of W of the NL σ M action:

$$S_0^{(4)} + S_h^{(4)} = -\frac{g}{64} \int_{\mathbf{r}} \sum_{\alpha_i, n_i} \left(\nabla_{12} \nabla_{34} + \nabla_{14} \nabla_{23} + \frac{\omega_{n_{12} + n_{34}}}{D} + 2h^2 \right) \text{tr} \left[(w(\mathbf{r}_1))_{n_1 n_2}^{\alpha_1 \alpha_2} (w^\dagger(\mathbf{r}_2))_{n_2 n_3}^{\alpha_2 \alpha_3} \times (w(\mathbf{r}_3))_{n_3 n_4}^{\alpha_3 \alpha_4} (w^\dagger(\mathbf{r}_4))_{n_4 n_1}^{\alpha_4 \alpha_1} \right] \Big|_{\mathbf{r}_i = \mathbf{r}} \quad (42)$$

(here we use a shorthand notation $\nabla_{12} \equiv \nabla_1 + \nabla_2$) and

$$S_{\text{int}}^{(3)} = \frac{\pi T \Gamma t}{4} \sum_{\alpha, n} \int_{\mathbf{r}} \text{Tr} I_n^\alpha \mathbf{s} W \text{Tr} I_{-n}^\alpha \mathbf{s} \Lambda W^2, \quad (43a)$$

$$S_{\text{int}}^{(4)} = -\frac{\pi T \Gamma t}{16} \sum_{\alpha, n} \int_{\mathbf{r}} \text{Tr} I_n^\alpha \mathbf{s} \Lambda W^2 \text{Tr} I_{-n}^\alpha \mathbf{s} \Lambda W^2. \quad (43b)$$

Performing averaging with the help of Wick theorem and Eq. (13), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\langle\left\langle \text{tr} [W_{nm}^{\alpha\beta} W_{mn}^{\beta\alpha}] [S_0^{(4)} + S_h^{(4)}] \right\rangle\right\rangle &= -\frac{8\nu}{g^2} \int_{\mathbf{r}'} \left[\nabla_{12} \nabla_{34} + \nabla_{14} \nabla_{32} + \frac{2|\varepsilon_n| + |\omega_{nm}|}{D} + 2h^2 \right] \hat{\mathcal{D}}(i2|\varepsilon_n|; \mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) \hat{\mathcal{D}}(i|\omega_{nm}|; \mathbf{r}_3, \mathbf{r}) \\
&\times \hat{\mathcal{D}}(i|\omega_{nm}|; \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}_4) \Big|_{\mathbf{r}_i=\mathbf{r}'} + \frac{96\pi T\gamma}{g^2 D} \sum_{\omega_k > |\varepsilon_n|} \left[\nabla_{12} \nabla_{34} + \nabla_{14} \nabla_{32} + \frac{|\omega_k| + |\omega_{nm}|}{D} + 2h^2 \right] \widehat{\mathcal{D}}^t(i|\omega_k|; \mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) \hat{\mathcal{D}}(i|\omega_{nm}|; \mathbf{r}_3, \mathbf{r}) \\
&\times \hat{\mathcal{D}}(i|\omega_{nm}|; \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}_4) \Big|_{\mathbf{r}_i=\mathbf{r}'} + (n \leftrightarrow m) = -\frac{16\nu}{g^2} \int_{qp} \left(p^2 + q^2 + \frac{2|\varepsilon_n| + |\omega_{nm}|}{D} + 2h^2 \right) \mathcal{D}_p(i2|\varepsilon_n|) \mathcal{D}_q^2(i|\omega_{nm}|) - \frac{16\nu}{g^2} \int_{qp} \left(4p_x^2 \right. \\
&+ 2p_x q_x + p^2 + q^2 + \frac{2|\varepsilon_n| + |\omega_{nm}|}{D} + 2h^2 \left. \right) \mathcal{D}_p(i2|\varepsilon_n|) \mathcal{D}_q(i|\omega_{nm}|) \mathcal{D}_{q_x+2p_x, q_{\parallel}}(i|\omega_{nm}|) + 2 \frac{96\pi T\gamma}{g^2 D} \sum_{\omega_k > |\varepsilon_n|} \int_{qp} \left(4p_x^2 + 2p_x q_x + p^2 \right. \\
&+ q^2 + \frac{|\omega_k| + |\omega_{nm}|}{D} + 2h^2 \left. \right) \mathcal{D}_p^t(i\omega_k) \mathcal{D}_q(i|\omega_{nm}|) \mathcal{D}_{q_x+2p_x, q_{\parallel}}(i|\omega_{nm}|) + \frac{192\pi T\gamma}{g^2 D} \sum_{\omega_k > |\varepsilon_n|} \int_{qp} \left(p^2 + q^2 + \frac{|\omega_k| + |\omega_{nm}|}{D} + 2h^2 \right) \\
&\times \mathcal{D}_p^t(i\omega_k) \mathcal{D}_q^2(i|\omega_{nm}|) + (n \leftrightarrow m) \rightarrow -5\nu \frac{(2t)^2 h^{2\epsilon}}{\epsilon^2} + 6 \frac{(2t)^2 h^{2\epsilon}}{\epsilon^2} \left[5 \ln(1+\gamma) + \frac{\epsilon\gamma}{1+\gamma} \right] + \frac{192\gamma}{g^2} I_{110}^0(1+\gamma). \quad (44)
\end{aligned}$$

Here we introduced the following notation

$$[\mathcal{D}_{q_x, q_{\parallel}}(i\omega)]^{-1} = q_x^2 + q_{\parallel}^2 + \omega/D + h^2. \quad (45)$$

We emphasize that appearance of such diffuson as defined in Eq. (45) is specific for the problem of boundary multifractality. The corresponding integrals are evaluated in Appendix A. The definition of the integral I_{110}^0 is given in Appendix A. Instead of computing the integral I_{110}^0 separately, it is convenient to calculate it in combination with two other similar integrals, see below.

The last contribution in Eq. (39) can be evaluated using the following simplification which is possible due to different replica indices, $\alpha \neq \beta$:

$$S_{\text{int}}^{(4)} + \frac{1}{2} (S_{\text{int}}^{(3)})^2 \rightarrow - \sum_{\nu n} \int_{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'} \left[\delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') - \frac{\gamma|\omega_n|}{D} \widehat{\mathcal{D}}^t(i|\omega_n|; \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \right] \frac{\pi T \Gamma_t}{4} \sum_{j=1}^3 \text{Tr} I_{-n}^{\nu} \mathbf{s}_j \Lambda W^2(\mathbf{r}) \text{Tr} I_{-n}^{\nu} \mathbf{s}_j \Lambda W^2(\mathbf{r}'). \quad (46)$$

After tedious but straightforward calculations, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\langle\left\langle \text{tr} W_{nm}^{\alpha\beta} W_{mn}^{\beta\alpha} \left[S_{\text{int}}^{(4)} + \frac{(S_{\text{int}}^{(3)})^2}{2} \right] \right\rangle\right\rangle &= \frac{96\pi T\gamma}{g^2 D} \int \left(\sum_{\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r}''} + \sum_{|\varepsilon_n| > \omega_k} + \sum_{|\varepsilon_m| > \omega_k} \right) \left[\frac{\gamma|\omega_k|}{D} \widehat{\mathcal{D}}^t(i|\omega_k|; \mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r}'') - \delta(\mathbf{r}' - \mathbf{r}'') \right] \hat{\mathcal{D}}(i|\varepsilon_n| + i|\varepsilon_m|; \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \\
&\times \hat{\mathcal{D}}(i|\varepsilon_n| + i|\varepsilon_m|; \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'') \hat{\mathcal{D}}(i|\varepsilon_n| + i|\varepsilon_m| - i\omega_k; \mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r}'') \simeq \frac{192\pi T\gamma}{g^2 D} \int \left(\sum_{|\varepsilon_n| > \omega_k} + \sum_{|\varepsilon_m| > \omega_k} \right) \left[\frac{\gamma|\omega_k|}{D} \mathcal{D}_{p+q}^t(i|\omega_k|) - 1 \right] \mathcal{D}_q(i|\varepsilon_n| + i|\varepsilon_m|) \\
&\times \left[\mathcal{D}_q(i|\varepsilon_n| + i|\varepsilon_m|) + \mathcal{D}_{q_x+2p_x, q_{\parallel}}(i|\varepsilon_n| + i|\varepsilon_m|) \right] \mathcal{D}_p(i|\varepsilon_n| + i|\varepsilon_m| - i\omega_k) = 6 \frac{(2t)^2 h^{2\epsilon}}{\epsilon^2} \left[\frac{2\gamma - (2+\gamma) \ln(1+\gamma)}{\gamma} - \epsilon \frac{(2+\gamma) \ln(1+\gamma)}{\gamma} \right. \\
&\left. - \frac{\epsilon\gamma}{1+\gamma} - \epsilon \frac{2+\gamma}{\gamma} \left(\text{li}_2(-\gamma) - \frac{1}{4} \ln^2(1+\gamma) \right) \right] - \frac{192\gamma}{g^2} \left[I_{110}^0(1) - \gamma I_{111}^1(1+\gamma) \right]. \quad (47)
\end{aligned}$$

Here $\text{li}_2(z) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} z^k/k^2$ denotes the polylogarithm. Again we emphasize the emergence of boundary diffusons (45) in the expression (47). Combing the above results, Eqs. (40)–(44) and (47), we find

$$\begin{aligned}
K_{2,2}^{(\text{irr})} &= \left\{ \mu_2(\nu - 6 \ln(1+\gamma)) + 1 + \frac{\mu_2\nu}{8} - \frac{3\mu_2}{2} f(\gamma) + \frac{3\epsilon\mu_2}{4} \left[\frac{2+3\gamma}{4\gamma} \ln^2(1+\gamma) + \frac{2+\gamma}{\gamma} \left(\text{li}_2(-\gamma) + \ln(1+\gamma) \right) \right] \right\} \frac{(2t)^2 h^{2\epsilon}}{\epsilon^2} \\
&\quad - \frac{24\gamma\mu_2}{g^2} \left[I_{110}^0(1+\gamma) - I_{110}^0(1) + \gamma I_{111}^1(1+\gamma) \right]. \quad (48)
\end{aligned}$$

Using the result for the combination of I -integrals from

Eq. (A11) in Appendix A, we obtain

$$K_{2,2}^{(\text{irr})} = \left[\mu_2(\nu - 6 \ln(1+\gamma)) + (b_2^{(2)} + \epsilon\mu_2 b_3) \right] \frac{(2t)^2 h^{2\epsilon}}{\epsilon^2}, \quad (49)$$

where

$$b_2^{(2)} = 1 + \frac{\mu_2 v}{8} - \frac{3\mu_2}{2} f(\gamma), \quad b_3 = \frac{3}{4} \left\{ \frac{2+3\gamma}{4\gamma} \ln^2(1+\gamma) + \frac{2+\gamma}{\gamma} [\text{li}_2(-\gamma) + \ln(1+\gamma)] - \frac{\gamma}{4} \Phi(\gamma) \right\}. \quad (50)$$

Here we introduced the function $\Phi(\gamma) = \ln^2(1+\gamma)/\gamma$ (see Eqs. (A12) and (A13)). We note that $\Phi(\gamma)$ appears from the combination of I -integrals.

3. Anomalous dimension

Employing the one-loop (see Eq. (38)) and two-loop (see Eq. (49)) results, we write the operator K_2 in the following form

$$K_2 = (Z^{(s)})^2 M_2^{(s)} K_2[\Lambda]. \quad (51)$$

Here $K_2[\Lambda] = 1$ is the classical value of K_2 and

$$M_2^{(s)} = 1 + Z^{-2} (K_{2,1}^{(\text{irr})} + K_{2,2}^{(\text{irr})}) = 1 + \mu_2 \frac{2th^\epsilon}{\epsilon} + (b_2^{(2)} + \epsilon\mu_2 b_3) \frac{(2t)^2 h^{2\epsilon}}{\epsilon^2} = 1 + \mu_2 \frac{2th^\epsilon}{\epsilon} + (b_2^{(2)} + \epsilon\mu_2 \tilde{b}_3) \frac{(2t)^2 h^{2\epsilon}}{\epsilon^2}. \quad (52)$$

where $\tilde{b}_3 = b_3 + b/4$ with b given by Eq. (18). Next we applying the minimal subtraction scheme to Eq. (52). We note that the following relation holds (for $\mu_2 = -1$ and 2)

$$2\mu_2(2\mu_2 - a_1) = 8b_2^{(2)} \quad (53)$$

that guarantees the finiteness of the anomalous dimension at $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. Hence, we obtain the anomalous dimensions for two eigenoperators $\mathcal{K}_{(2)}$ and $\mathcal{K}_{(1,1)}$ at the boundary

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_2 = -1, & \quad \eta_{(2)}^{(s)} = -2t(1 + 6c(\gamma)t) + O(t^3), \\ \mu_2 = 2, & \quad \eta_{(1,1)}^{(s)} = 4t(1 + 6c(\gamma)t) + O(t^3). \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

C. Local eigenoperators with arbitrary number of Q matrices

The above results for the local eigenoperators with two Q matrix can be extended to the case of arbitrary number of Q matrices in the same way as it has been done for the bulk generalized multifractality (see Ref. [65]). The eigenoperator with the number q of the Q matrices involved characterized by the Young tableau $\lambda = (k_1, \dots, k_s)$ (with $\sum_{j=1}^s k_j = |\lambda|$), becomes

$$\mathcal{K}_\lambda = (Z^{(s)})^{|\lambda|} M_\lambda^{(s)} \mathcal{K}_\lambda[\Lambda]. \quad (55)$$

The quantity $M_\lambda^{(s)}$ determines the anomalous dimension

$$\eta_\lambda^{(s)} = -\frac{d \ln M_\lambda^{(s)}}{d\ell} = 2\mu_{2,1,\dots,1} t [1 + 6c(\gamma)t] + O(t^3). \quad (56)$$

where $\mu_{2,1,\dots,1}$ is given by Eq. (26). Equation (56) is the main result of our work.

The anomalous dimensions $\eta_\lambda^{(s)}$ determine the scaling with the system size L of the eigen operators near the boundary at criticality,

$$\mathcal{K}_\lambda \sim L^{-x_\lambda^{(s)}}, \quad x_\lambda^{(s)} = |\lambda| x_{(1)}^{(s)} + \Delta_\lambda^{(s)}. \quad (57)$$

Here the exponent $x_{(1)}^{(s)}$ coincides with the magnitude of $\eta_{(1)}^{(s)}$, given by Eq. (34), at the fixed point, $x_{(1)}^{(s)} = \eta_{(1)}^{(s)*}$. Similarly, the exponent $\Delta_\lambda^{(s)}$ is equal to the anomalous dimension of $M_\lambda^{(s)}$ at the fixed point, $\Delta_\lambda^{(s)} = \eta_\lambda^{(s)}$.

V. DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

A. Generalization to higher orders in t

In this paper we determine the anomalous dimensions of the local eigenoperators situated near the boundary for the symmetry class C in the presence of interaction. We apply perturbative renormalization group expansion for the anomalous dimensions upto the second order in t . It was known that bulk and surface anomalous dimensions within the first order in t are related by the factor 2. We find that the same factor 2 appears within the second order. Interestingly, that it happens in spite of the fact that the two-loop contribution to anomalous dimension is non-trivial function of interaction strength γ .

Naïve idea could be that the bulk and surface exponents are related by the factor 2 in all orders of expansion in t . However, it is definitely not the case for spin quantum Hall transition in $d=2$ dimensions. The set of bulk and surface exponents which are known exactly from mapping to percolation [8, 15, 55–58] are not related by a factor of 2, e.g. $x_{(2)} = 1/4$ while $x_{(2)}^{(s)} = 1/3$. Additionally, numerical computation of x_λ and $x_\lambda^{(s)}$ indicate that the ratio between them is not a universal factor equal 2 [18].

Having in mind the above discussion, it would be interesting to develop scenario how a factor of 2 in weak coupling transforms into nontrivial factors different for different operators. Is the factor 2 a feature of the perturbative expansion to all orders in t while non-perturbative instanton effects are responsible for transformation to nontrivial factors? Or is the factor 2 limited to the lowest order terms of the series in t only?

B. Relations to other symmetry classes

The results reported in this paper for the surface anomalous dimensions can be directly translated to the standard Wigner-Dyson classes (classes A, AI, and AII) where the bulk generalized multifractality in the presence of interaction has been recently developed [62–64]. Similarly, within two-loop approximation the boundary multifractal exponents are twice larger than the bulk ones. Moreover, our results can be extended to the other two superconducting classes, CI and DIII, that allow interaction within the Finkel'stein NL σ M.

C. The role of topology

Similar to the class A, the NL σ M for class C allows the presence of the topological θ -term. The topological term does not change the classification of the local pure scaling operators but, certainly, contributes to their anomalous dimensions. At weak disorder, $t \ll 1$, where the instanton effects can be treated in a controlled manner, the question how instantons affect the anomalous dimension of an arbitrary local operator is still not well understood. The only exception is the anomalous dimensions of bilinear in Q eigenoperators for class A in the absence of interaction [71]. Instantons are expected to affect both bulk and boundary anomalous dimensions.

D. Breakdown of the Weyl symmetry

In the absence of interaction, the Weyl-group invariance [7] forces not only the bulk generalized multifractal dimensions x_λ but also surface generalized multifractal dimensions $x_\lambda^{(s)}$ to obey the symmetry relations [18]. These symmetry relations make the exponents $x_\lambda^{(s)}$ to be the same for the eigenoperators related by the following symmetry operations: reflection, $k_j \rightarrow -c_j - k_j$, and permutation of some pair, $k_{j/i} \rightarrow k_{i/j} + (c_{i/j} - c_{j/i})/2$. Our one-loop results for the boundary anomalous dimensions are consistent with the Weyl-group invariance symmetry in the absence of interaction. The presence of interaction is known to break the symmetry relations between exponents characterizing bulk generalized multifractality [65]. Similar situation – interaction-induced breaking of Weyl symmetry relations – occurs with the surface exponents within two-loop approximation considered in this

paper. To illustrate how it occurs let us consider the Mott-Anderson transition in $d = 2 + \epsilon$ dimensions. Then as follows from Eq. (19), there is a line of fixed points at $t_* = \epsilon/(1 + 6f(\gamma))$ with arbitrary γ . The surface generalized multifractal exponents becomes (to the order ϵ)

$$x_\lambda^{(s)} = \frac{\epsilon}{[1 + 6f(\gamma)]} \sum_{j=1}^s k_j (-c_j - 3 \ln(1 + \gamma) - k_j). \quad (58)$$

The above expression is inconsistent with Weyl symmetry in the presence of interaction, $\gamma \neq 0$. It occurs due to appearance of γ -dependence in $x_{(1)}^{(s)}$. Such a situation suggests also breaking Weyl symmetry for $\gamma \neq 0$ at the spin quantum Hall transition in $d=2$. Unfortunately, present numerical computing power [72–75] is not enough to access generalized multifractal exponents and to check our predictions, in particular, to test violation of symmetry relations in the presence of interaction.

E. Summary

To summarize we developed the theory of the generalized boundary multifractality in class C in the presence of electron-electron interaction. Employing two-loop renormalization group approximation controlled by inverse spin conductance t , we computed the anomalous dimensions of the pure scaling operators at the boundary of the sample. At one-loop approximation we found expected result that the boundary anomalous dimensions are two times larger than the bulk ones. Surprisingly, we found that the same relation (a factor 2 difference) holds within two-loop approximation in spite of the nontrivial dependence of bulk and surface anomalous dimensions on interaction parameter γ . Consequently, we showed that the presence of interaction invalidates exact symmetry relations between generalized surface multifractal exponents which are consequence of Weyl symmetry in the noninteracting case. We discussed future developments and applications of our theory.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors are grateful to J. Karcher and A. Mirlin for collaboration on the related project. We thank I. Gruzberg and A. Mirlin for useful discussions and comments. The research was supported by Russian Science Foundation (grant No. 22-42-04416).

Appendix A: Evaluation of contractions

1. Eq. (44)

We start from rewriting the integrals over momenta in Eq. (44) as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\langle\left\langle \text{tr } W_{nm}^{\alpha\beta} W_{mn}^{\beta\alpha} \left[S_0^{(4)} + S_h^{(4)} \right] \right\rangle\right\rangle &\rightarrow -\frac{32\nu}{g^2} \int_{qp} \left[\mathcal{D}_p(0) \mathcal{D}_q(0) + \mathcal{D}_q^2(0) \right] + \frac{384\pi T\gamma}{g^2 D} \int_{qp} \sum_{\omega>0} \left[\mathcal{D}_p^t(i\omega) \mathcal{D}_q(0) + \mathcal{D}_p^t(i\omega) \mathcal{D}_q^2(0) \right] \\
&- \frac{32\nu}{g^2} \int_{qp} \left[\mathcal{D}_{p_x - q_x, \mathbf{q}_{\parallel}}(0) \mathcal{D}_{p_x + q_x, \mathbf{q}_{\parallel}}(0) + \mathcal{D}_p(0) \mathcal{D}_{p_x + q_x, \mathbf{q}_{\parallel}}(0) + 2p_x^2 \mathcal{D}_p(0) \mathcal{D}_{p_x + q_x, \mathbf{q}_{\parallel}}(0) \mathcal{D}_{p_x - q_x, \mathbf{q}_{\parallel}}(0) \right] \\
&+ \frac{384\pi T\gamma}{g^2 D} \int_{qp} \sum_{\omega>0} \left[\mathcal{D}_p^t(i\omega) \mathcal{D}_q(0) + \mathcal{D}_p^t(i\omega) + 2p_x(q_x + 2p_x) \mathcal{D}_p^t(i\omega) \mathcal{D}_q(0) \right] \mathcal{D}_{q_x + 2p_x, \mathbf{q}_{\parallel}}(0). \tag{A1}
\end{aligned}$$

Next we find

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\langle\left\langle \text{tr } W_{nm}^{\alpha\beta} W_{mn}^{\beta\alpha} \left[S_0^{(4)} + S_h^{(4)} \right] \right\rangle\right\rangle &\rightarrow -4\nu \frac{(2t)^2 h^{2\epsilon}}{\epsilon^2} - \frac{64\nu}{g^2} I_1 + \frac{192\gamma}{g^2} \left[2J_{110}^0(1+\gamma) + J_{020}^0(1+\gamma) + I_{110}^0(1+\gamma) \right. \\
&\left. + 2\ln(1+\gamma) I_1 \right] \rightarrow -4\nu \left(1 + \frac{1}{4} \right) \frac{(2t)^2 h^{2\epsilon}}{\epsilon^2} + 24 \frac{(2t)^2 h^{2\epsilon}}{\epsilon^2} \left[\left(1 + \frac{1}{4} \right) \ln(1+\gamma) + \frac{\epsilon\gamma}{4(1+\gamma)} \right] + \frac{192\gamma}{g^2} I_{110}^0(1+\gamma) \tag{A2}
\end{aligned}$$

Here we introduce the following notations for integral over momenta and frequency,

$$J_{\nu\mu\eta}^{\delta}(a) = \int_{qp} \int_0^{\infty} ds s^{\delta} \frac{1}{(p^2 + h^2 + s)^{\nu}} \frac{1}{(p^2 + h^2 + as)} \frac{1}{(q^2 + h^2)^{\mu}} \frac{1}{(\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{q})^2 + h^2 + s)^{\eta}} \tag{A3}$$

Also we used the following relations

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_q \mathcal{D}_q(0) &= -\frac{2\Omega_d h^{\epsilon} \Gamma(1 - \epsilon/2) \Gamma(1 + \epsilon/2)}{\epsilon}, \quad \int_{qp} \mathcal{D}_q^2(0) = \int_{qp} \mathcal{D}_{p_x - q_x, \mathbf{q}_{\parallel}}(0) \mathcal{D}_{p_x + q_x, \mathbf{q}_{\parallel}}(0) = 0, \\
\frac{2\pi T}{D} \sum_{\omega>0} \mathcal{D}_p^t(i\omega) &= \frac{\ln(1+\gamma)}{\gamma} \mathcal{D}_p(0), \tag{A4}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{2\pi T\gamma}{D} \int_{qp} \sum_{\omega>0} 2p_x(q_x + 2p_x) \mathcal{D}_p^t(i\omega) \mathcal{D}_q(0) \mathcal{D}_{q_x + 2p_x, \mathbf{q}_{\parallel}}(0) &= \frac{2\pi T\gamma}{D} \int_{qp} \sum_{\omega>0} 2p_x(q_x + p_x) \mathcal{D}_p^t(i\omega) \mathcal{D}_{q_x - p_x, \mathbf{q}_{\parallel}}(0) \mathcal{D}_{q_x + p_x, \mathbf{q}_{\parallel}}(0) \\
&= 2\ln(1+\gamma) \int_{qp} p_x^2 \mathcal{D}_p(0) \mathcal{D}_{q_x - p_x, \mathbf{q}_{\parallel}}(0) \mathcal{D}_{q_x + p_x, \mathbf{q}_{\parallel}}(0) = 2\ln(1+\gamma) I_1,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\Omega_d = S_d/[2(2\pi)^d]$ and $S_d = 2\pi^{d/2}/\Gamma(d/2)$ is the area of the d -dimensional sphere. We use $t = 4\Omega_d/g$ at arbitrary dimensionality such that $t = 1/(\pi g)$ at $d = 2$. The integral I_1 is evaluated as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &= \int_{qp} p_x^2 \mathcal{D}_p(0) \mathcal{D}_{p_x + q_x, \mathbf{q}_{\parallel}}(0) \mathcal{D}_{p_x - q_x, \mathbf{q}_{\parallel}}(0) = \int_0^1 dz \int_{qp} \frac{p_x^2}{(p^2 + h^2)(\mathbf{q}_{\parallel}^2 + (q_x + p_x(1-2z))^2 + 4p_x^2 z(1-z) + h^2)^2} \\
&= \int_0^1 dz \int_{qp} \frac{p_x^2}{(p^2 + h^2)(4p_x^2 z(1-z) + h^2)^{2-d/2} (q^2 + h^2)^2} = h^{d-4} \Omega_d \frac{\Gamma(d/2) \Gamma(2-d/2)}{\Gamma(2)} \frac{\Gamma(3-d/2)}{\Gamma(2-d/2)} \int_0^1 dz \int_0^1 du \\
&\times \int_p \frac{p_x^2 u^{1-d/2}}{(\mathbf{p}_{\parallel}^2(1-u) + p_x^2[1-u(1-2z)^2] + h^2)^{3-d/2}} = h^{2\epsilon} \Omega_d^2 \frac{\Gamma(d/2) \Gamma(2-d/2)}{\Gamma(2)} \frac{\Gamma(3-d/2)}{\Gamma(2-d/2)} \frac{\Gamma(d/2+1) \Gamma(2-d)}{d \Gamma(3-d/2)} \\
&\times \int_0^1 du \int_0^1 dv u^{1-d/2} (1-u)^{-(d-1)/2} (1-uv^2)^{-3/2} = -\frac{h^{2\epsilon} \Omega_d^2}{2\epsilon} \Gamma^2(d/2) \Gamma(3-d) \int_0^1 du u^{1-d/2} (1-u)^{-d/2} \\
&= -\frac{h^{2\epsilon} \Omega_d^2}{2\epsilon} \Gamma^2(d/2) \Gamma(3-d) \frac{\Gamma(2-d/2) \Gamma(1-d/2)}{\Gamma(3-d)} = \frac{A_{\epsilon} h^{2\epsilon}}{\epsilon^2}, \tag{A5}
\end{aligned}$$

where $A_\epsilon = \Omega_d^2 \Gamma^2(1-\epsilon/2) \Gamma^2(1+\epsilon/2)$. The evaluation of integrals $J_{\nu\mu\eta}^\delta(a)$ is described in Ref. [63]. Also we introduced the following new integrals

$$I_{\nu\mu\eta}^\delta(a) = \int_{qp} \int_0^\infty ds s^\delta \frac{1}{(q^2+h^2)^\nu} \frac{1}{(p^2+h^2+as)} \frac{1}{((q_x+2p_x)^2+\mathbf{q}_\parallel^2+h^2)^\mu} \frac{1}{(\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{q})^2+h^2+s)^\eta}. \quad (\text{A6})$$

2. Eq. (47)

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \left\langle \text{tr} W_{nm}^{\alpha\beta} W_{mn}^{\beta\alpha} \left[S_{\text{int}}^{(4)} + \frac{1}{2} (S_{\text{int}}^{(3)})^2 \right] \right\rangle \right\rangle &\rightarrow -\frac{384\pi T\gamma}{g^2 D} \int_{qp} \sum_{\omega>0} \left[1 - \frac{\gamma\omega}{D} \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{q}}^t(i\omega) \right] \mathcal{D}_p(i\omega) \left[\mathcal{D}_q(0) + \mathcal{D}_{q_x+2p_x, \mathbf{q}_\parallel}(0) \right] \\ &- \frac{192\gamma}{g^2} \left[J_{020}^0(1) - \gamma J_{021}^0(1+\gamma) + I_{110}^0(1) - \gamma I_{111}^0(1+\gamma) \right] = -6 \frac{(2t)^2 h^{2\epsilon}}{\epsilon^2} \left[-\frac{2\gamma - (2+\gamma) \ln(1+\gamma)}{\gamma} + \frac{\epsilon\gamma}{1+\gamma} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \epsilon \frac{(2+\gamma) \ln(1+\gamma)}{\gamma} + \epsilon \frac{2+\gamma}{\gamma} \left(\text{li}_2(-\gamma) + \frac{1}{4} \ln^2(1+\gamma) \right) \right] - \frac{192\gamma}{g^2} \left[I_{110}^0(1) - \gamma I_{111}^0(1+\gamma) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A7})$$

Here we used the known results for the integrals $J_{\nu\mu\eta}^\delta(a)$ from Ref. [63]. Instead of computation of integrals I_{110}^0 , I_{110}^0 , and I_{111}^0 separately, it is more convenient to evaluate the combination they appear together:

$$\begin{aligned} I_{110}^0(1+\gamma) - I_{110}^0(1) + \gamma I_{111}^0(1+\gamma) &= \gamma \int_{qp} \int_0^\infty ds s \left[\frac{1}{(\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{q})^2 + (1+\gamma)s + h^2} - \frac{1}{(p^2 + (1+\gamma)s + h^2)} \right] \frac{1}{(p^2 + s + h^2)} \\ &\times \frac{1}{(q^2+h^2)((q_x+2p_x)^2+\mathbf{q}_\parallel^2+h^2)} = -\gamma \int_{qp} \int_0^\infty ds \frac{(q^2+2\mathbf{p}\mathbf{q})s}{((\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{q})^2 + (1+\gamma)s + h^2)(p^2 + (1+\gamma)s + h^2)(p^2 + s + h^2)} \\ &\times \frac{1}{(q^2+h^2)((q_x+2p_x)^2+\mathbf{q}_\parallel^2+h^2)} = \int_{qp} \int_0^\infty ds \left[\frac{1}{(p^2 + (1+\gamma)s + h^2)} - \frac{1}{(p^2 + s + h^2)} \right] \frac{(q^2+2\mathbf{p}\mathbf{q})}{(q^2+h^2)((q_x+2p_x)^2+\mathbf{q}_\parallel^2+h^2)} \\ &\times \frac{1}{((\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{q})^2 + (1+\gamma)s + h^2)} = - \int_{qp} \int_0^\infty ds \frac{(q^2+2\mathbf{p}\mathbf{q})}{(p^2+s+h^2)((\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{q})^2 + (1+\gamma)s + h^2)(q^2+h^2)((q_x+2p_x)^2+\mathbf{q}_\parallel^2+h^2)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A8})$$

Here in the last line we employed the following transformation $\mathbf{p} \rightarrow \mathbf{P} + \mathbf{Q}$ and $\mathbf{q} \rightarrow -\mathbf{Q}$ that makes $q^2 + 2\mathbf{p}\mathbf{q} \rightarrow -Q^2 - 2\mathbf{P}\mathbf{Q}$. Now we employ the Feynman trick and find

$$\begin{aligned} I_{110}^0(1+\gamma) - I_{110}^0(1) + \gamma I_{111}^0(1+\gamma) &= -\Gamma(4) \int_0^1 dz \int dx_1 dx_2 dx_3 \delta(1-x_1-x_2-x_3) \int_{qp} \int_0^\infty ds (q^2+2\mathbf{p}\mathbf{q}) \left[x_1 (\mathbf{p}_\parallel + z\mathbf{q}_\parallel)^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (x_2+x_3+z(1-z)x_1) \mathbf{q}_\parallel^2 + (x_1+4x_3) \left(p_x + \frac{zx_1+2x_3}{x_1+4x_3} q_x \right)^2 + \frac{(x_1(x_2+x_3+z(1-z)x_1)+4x_2x_3)}{x_1+4x_3} q_x^2 + (1+\gamma z)s + h^2 \right]^{-4} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A9})$$

Performing integration over momenta and frequency and using the parametrization $x_1 = s/(s+1)$, $x_2 = u/(s+1)$, $x_3 = (1-u)/(s+1)$, where $0 \leq s < \infty$ and $0 \leq u \leq 1$ (with the Jacobian $1/(s+1)^3$), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I_{110}^0(1+\gamma) - I_{110}^0(1) + \gamma I_{111}^0(1+\gamma) &= \frac{h^{2\epsilon} \Omega_d^2 \Gamma^2(d/2) \Gamma(3-d)}{2\epsilon} \int_0^1 dz \frac{(1-2z)}{1+\gamma z} \int_0^\infty ds \int_0^1 du (s+1)^{d-2} s^{(1-d)/2} \\ &\times [1+z(1-z)s]^{(1-d)/2} \left[s(1+z(1-z)s) + 4u(1-u) \right]^{-1/2} \left[\frac{d-1}{1+z(1-z)s} + \frac{s}{s(1+z(1-z)s) + 4u(1-u)} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A10})$$

The integrals over z , s , and u are convergent in $d = 2$, therefore, we can set $d = 2$. Then we find

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{110}^0(1+\gamma) - I_{110}^0(1) + \gamma I_{111}^1(1+\gamma) &= \frac{h^{2\epsilon} A_\epsilon}{2\epsilon} \int_0^1 dz \frac{(1-2z)}{1+\gamma z} \int_0^\infty ds \frac{1}{\sqrt{s(1+z(1-z)s)^3}} \left[\arctan \frac{1}{\sqrt{s(1+z(1-z)s)}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{\sqrt{s(1+z(1-z)s)}}{[1+s(1+z(1-z)s)]} \right] = \frac{h^{2\epsilon} A_\epsilon}{2\epsilon} \int_0^1 dz \frac{(1-2z)}{1+\gamma z} \int_0^\infty dy \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{z(1-z)}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{y(1+y)^3}} \arctan \frac{\sqrt{z(1-z)}}{\sqrt{y(1+y)}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{(y+1)[z(1-z)+y(1+y)]} \right] = \frac{h^{2\epsilon} A_\epsilon}{2\epsilon} \int_0^1 \frac{dz}{1+\gamma z} \left[\frac{(1-2z)}{\sqrt{z(1-z)}} \int_0^\infty \frac{dv}{\cosh^2(v/2)} \arctan \frac{2\sqrt{z(1-z)}}{\sinh v} + \frac{\ln(1-z)}{z} - \frac{\ln z}{1-z} \right] \\
&= \frac{h^{2\epsilon} A_\epsilon}{2\epsilon} \Phi(\gamma). \tag{A11}
\end{aligned}$$

Here we introduced $y = z(1-z)s$ and $v = 2 \operatorname{arcsinh} \sqrt{y}$. The function $\Phi(\gamma)$ is given as follows

$$\Phi(\gamma) = \int_0^1 dz \frac{F(z)}{1+\gamma z}, \quad F(z) = -(1-2z) \left(\frac{\ln z}{1-z} + \frac{\ln(1-z)}{z} \right) + \frac{\ln(1-z)}{z} - \frac{\ln z}{1-z} = 2 \ln(1-z) - 2 \ln z. \tag{A12}$$

Finally, integrating over z exactly, we find

$$\Phi(\gamma) = \frac{\ln^2(1+\gamma)}{\gamma} \tag{A13}$$

-
- [1] P. W. Anderson, "Absence of diffusion in certain random lattices," *Phys. Rev.* **109**, 1492 (1958).
- [2] F. Wegner, "Inverse participation ratio in $2 + \epsilon$ dimensions," *Z. Phys. B* **36**, 209 (1980).
- [3] C. Castellani and L. Peliti, "Multifractal wavefunction at the localisation threshold," *J. Phys. A* **19**, L429 (1986).
- [4] A. D. Mirlin, "Statistics of energy levels and eigenfunctions in disordered systems," *Phys. Rep.* **326**, 259 (2000).
- [5] F. Evers and A. D. Mirlin, "Anderson transitions," *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **80**, 1355 (2008).
- [6] D. Höf and F. Wegner, "Calculation of anomalous dimensions for the nonlinear sigma model," *Nucl. Phys. B* **275**, 561 (1986).
- [7] I. A. Gruzberg, A. D. Mirlin, and M. R. Zirnbauer, "Classification and symmetry properties of scaling dimensions at Anderson transitions," *Phys. Rev. B* **87**, 125144 (2013).
- [8] Jonas F. Karcher, Ilya A. Gruzberg, and Alexander D. Mirlin, "Generalized multifractality at the spin quantum Hall transition: Percolation mapping and pure-scaling observables," *Phys. Rev. B* **105**, 184205 (2022).
- [9] J. F. Karcher, Ilya A. Gruzberg, and Alexander D. Mirlin, "Generalized multifractality at metal-insulator transitions and in metallic phases of two-dimensional disordered systems," *Physical Review B* **106**, 104202 (2022).
- [10] Jonas F. Karcher, Ilya A. Gruzberg, and Alexander D. Mirlin, "Generalized multifractality in two-dimensional disordered systems of chiral symmetry classes," *Physical Review B* **107**, 104202 (2023).
- [11] A. D. Mirlin, Y. V. Fyodorov, A. Mildemberger, and F. Evers, "Exact relations between multifractal exponents at the Anderson transition," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 046803 (2006).
- [12] I. A. Gruzberg, A. W. W. Ludwig, A. D. Mirlin, and M. R. Zirnbauer, "Symmetries of multifractal spectra and field theories of Anderson localization," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 086403 (2011).
- [13] A. R. Subramaniam, I. A. Gruzberg, A. W. W. Ludwig, F. Evers, A. Mildemberger, and A. D. Mirlin, "Surface criticality and multifractality at localization transitions," *Physical Review Letters* **96**, 126802 (2006).
- [14] A. Mildemberger, A. R. Subramaniam, R. Narayanan, F. Evers, I. A. Gruzberg, and A. D. Mirlin, "Boundary multifractality in critical one-dimensional systems with long-range hopping," *Physical Review B* **75**, 094204 (2007).
- [15] A. R. Subramaniam, I. A. Gruzberg, and A. W. W. Ludwig, "Boundary criticality and multifractality at the two-dimensional spin quantum Hall transition," *Phys. Rev. B* **78**, 245105 (2008).
- [16] F. Evers, A. Mildemberger, and A. D. Mirlin, "Multifractality at the quantum Hall transition: Beyond the parabolic paradigm," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 116803 (2008).
- [17] H. Obuse, A. R. Subramaniam, A. Furusaki, I. A. Gruzberg, and A. W. W. Ludwig, "Boundary multifractality at the integer quantum Hall plateau transition: Implications for the critical theory," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 116802 (2008).
- [18] S. S. Babkin, J. F. Karcher, I. S. Burmistrov, and A. D. Mirlin, "Generalized surface multifractality in 2D disordered systems," arXiv:2306.09455.
- [19] Jonas F. Karcher, Noah Charles, Ilya A. Gruzberg, and Alexander D. Mirlin, "Generalized multifractality at spin quantum Hall transition," *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **435**, 168584 (2021), special issue on Philip W. Anderson.

- [20] Jonas F. Karcher, Ilya A. Gruzberg, and Alexander D. Mirlin, “Metal-insulator transition in a two-dimensional system of chiral unitary class,” *Physical Review B* **107**, L020201 (2023).
- [21] M. Mascheck, S. Schmidt, M. Silies, T. Yatsui, K. Kitamura, M. Ohtsu, D. Leipold, E. Runge, and C. Lienau, “Observing the localization of light in space and time by ultrafast second-harmonic microscopy,” *Nat. Photonics* **6**, 293 (2012).
- [22] S. Faez, A. Strybulevych, J. H. Page, A. Lagendijk, and B. A. van Tiggelen, “Observation of multifractality in Anderson localization of ultrasound,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 155703 (2009).
- [23] A. Richardella, P. Roushan, S. Mack, B. Zhou, D. A. Huse, D. D. Awschalom, and A. Yazdani, “Visualizing critical correlations near the metal-insulator transition in $\text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{Mn}_x\text{As}$,” *Science* **327**, 665 (2010).
- [24] Mathieu Lizée, Matthias Stosiek, Igor Burmistrov, Tristan Cren, and Christophe Brun, “Local density of states fluctuations in a two-dimensional superconductor as a probe of quantum diffusion,” *Physical Review B* **107**, 174508 (2023).
- [25] M. V. Feigel’man, L. B. Ioffe, V. E. Kravtsov, and E. A. Yuzbashyan, “Eigenfunction fractality and pseudogap state near the superconductor-insulator transition,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 027001 (2007).
- [26] M.V. Feigel’man, L.B. Ioffe, V.E. Kravtsov, and E. Cuevas, “Fractal superconductivity near localization threshold,” *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **325**, 1390 (2010).
- [27] I. S. Burmistrov, I. V. Gornyi, and A. D. Mirlin, “Enhancement of the critical temperature of superconductors by Anderson localization,” *Physical Review Letters* **108**, 017002 (2012).
- [28] I. S. Burmistrov, I. V. Gornyi, and A. D. Mirlin, “Superconductor-insulator transitions: phase diagram and magnetoresistance,” *Phys. Rev. B* **92**, 014506 (2015).
- [29] L. Dell’Anna, “Enhancement of critical temperatures in disordered bipartite lattices,” *Phys. Rev. B* **88**, 195139 (2013).
- [30] I. S. Burmistrov, I. V. Gornyi, and A. D. Mirlin, “Multifractally-enhanced superconductivity in thin films,” *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **435**, 168499 (2021), special Issue on Localisation 2020.
- [31] E.S. Andriyakhina and I.S. Burmistrov, “Multifractally-enhanced superconductivity in two-dimensional systems with spin-orbit coupling,” *ZhETF* **162**, 522 (2022).
- [32] P. A. Nosov, I. S. Burmistrov, and S. Raghu, “Interplay of superconductivity and localization near a two-dimensional ferromagnetic quantum critical point,” *Physical Review B* **107**, 144508 (2023).
- [33] Bo Fan and A. M. García-García, “Enhanced phase-coherent multifractal two-dimensional superconductivity,” *Phys. Rev. B* **101**, 104509 (2020).
- [34] M. Stosiek, B. Lang, and F. Evers, “Self-consistent-field ensembles of disordered Hamiltonians: Efficient solver and application to superconducting films,” *Phys. Rev. B* **101**, 144503 (2020).
- [35] M. Stosiek, F. Evers, and I. S. Burmistrov, “Multifractal correlations of the local density of states in dirty superconducting films,” *Phys. Rev. Research* **3**, L042016 (2021).
- [36] M. S. Foster and E. A. Yuzbashyan, “Interaction-mediated surface-state instability in disordered three-dimensional topological superconductors with spin SU(2) symmetry,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 246801 (2012).
- [37] M. S. Foster, H.-Y. Xie, and Y.-Z. Chou, “Topological protection, disorder, and interactions: Survival at the surface of three-dimensional topological superconductors,” *Phys. Rev. B* **89**, 155140 (2014).
- [38] S. Kettemann and E. R. Mucciolo, “Free magnetic moments in disordered systems,” *JETP Lett.* **83**, 284 (2006).
- [39] T. Micklitz, A. Altland, T. A. Costi, and A. Rosch, “Universal dephasing rate due to diluted Kondo impurities,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 226601 (2006).
- [40] S. Kettemann and E. R. Mucciolo, “Disorder-quenched Kondo effect in mesoscopic electronic systems,” *Phys. Rev. B* **75**, 184407 (2007).
- [41] M. V. Feigel’man and V. E. Kravtsov, “Electron-phonon cooling power in Anderson insulators,” *Phys. Rev. B* **99**, 125415 (2019).
- [42] S. Kettemann, “Exponential orthogonality catastrophe at the Anderson metal-insulator transition,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, 146602 (2016).
- [43] I. S. Burmistrov and M. A. Skvortsov, “Magnetic disorder in superconductors: Enhancement by mesoscopic fluctuations,” *Phys. Rev. B* **97**, 014515 (2018).
- [44] S. S. Babkin, A. A. Lyublinskaya, and I. S. Burmistrov, “Broadened Yu-Shiba-Rusinov states in dirty superconducting films and heterostructures,” *Physical Review Research* **4**, 023202 (2022).
- [45] M. R. Zirnbauer, “Conformal field theory of the integer quantum Hall plateau transition,” arXiv:hep-th/9905054.
- [46] S. Kettemann and A. M. Tsvelik, “Information about the integer quantum Hall transition extracted from the autocorrelation function of spectral determinants,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 3689 (1999).
- [47] M. J. Bhaseen, I. I. Kogan, O. A. Soloviev, N. Taniguchi, and A. M. Tsvelik, “Towards a field theory of the plateau transitions in the integer quantum Hall effect,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **580**, 688 (2000).
- [48] A. M. Tsvelik, “Wave functions statistics at quantum hall critical point,” arXiv:cond-mat/0112008.
- [49] A. M. Tsvelik, “Evidence for the PSL(2—2) Wess-Zumino-Novikov-Witten model as a model for the plateau transition in the quantum Hall effect: Evaluation of numerical simulations,” *Phys. Rev. B* **75**, 184201 (2007).
- [50] M. R. Zirnbauer, “The integer quantum Hall plateau transition is a current algebra after all,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **941**, 458 (2019).
- [51] Jaychandran Padayasi and Ilya A. Gruzberg, “Conformal invariance and multifractality at Anderson transitions in arbitrary dimensions,” arXiv: 2306.07340.
- [52] R. Bondesan, D. Wieczorek, and M.R. Zirnbauer, “Gaussian free fields at the integer quantum Hall plateau transition,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **918**, 52 (2017).
- [53] V. Kagalovsky, B. Horovitz, Y. Avishai, and J. T. Chalker, “Quantum Hall plateau transitions in disordered superconductors,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 3516 (1999).
- [54] T. Senthil, J. B. Marston, and Matthew P. A. Fisher, “Spin quantum hall effect in unconventional superconductors,” *Phys. Rev. B* **60**, 4245 (1999).
- [55] Ilya A. Gruzberg, Andreas W. W. Ludwig, and N. Read, “Exact exponents for the spin quantum Hall transition,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 4524 (1999).
- [56] E. J. Beamd, John Cardy, and J. T. Chalker, “Quan-

- tum and classical localization, the spin quantum Hall effect, and generalizations,” *Phys. Rev. B* **65**, 214301 (2002).
- [57] A. D. Mirlin, F. Evers, and A. Mildenerger, “Wavefunction statistics and multifractality at the spin quantum Hall transition,” *J. Phys. A: Math. and Gen.* **36**, 3255 (2003).
- [58] F. Evers, A. Mildenerger, and A. D. Mirlin, “Multifractality at the spin quantum Hall transition,” *Phys. Rev. B* **67**, 041303 (2003).
- [59] Martin Puschmann, Daniel Hernangómez-Pérez, Bruno Lang, Soumya Bera, and Ferdinand Evers, “Quartic multifractality and finite-size corrections at the spin quantum Hall transition,” *Phys. Rev. B* **103**, 235167 (2021).
- [60] A. M. Finkel’stein, “Electron liquid in disordered conductors,” in *Soviet Scientific Reviews*, Vol. 14, edited by I. M. Khalatnikov (Harwood Academic Publishers, London, 1990).
- [61] D. Belitz and T. R. Kirkpatrick, “The Anderson-Mott transition,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **66**, 261 (1994).
- [62] I. S. Burmistrov, I. V. Gornyi, and A. D. Mirlin, “Multifractality at Anderson transitions with Coulomb interaction,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 066601 (2013).
- [63] I. S. Burmistrov, I. V. Gornyi, and A. D. Mirlin, “Multifractality and electron-electron interaction at Anderson transitions,” *Phys. Rev. B* **91**, 085427 (2015).
- [64] E. V. Repin and I. S. Burmistrov, “Mesoscopic fluctuations of the single-particle Green’s function at Anderson transitions with Coulomb interaction,” *Phys. Rev. B* **94**, 245442 (2016).
- [65] S. S. Babkin and I. S. Burmistrov, “Generalized multifractality in the spin quantum hall symmetry class with interaction,” *Phys. Rev. B* **106**, 125424 (2022).
- [66] D. J. Amit, “Field Theory, the Renormalization Group, and Critical Phenomena,” (World Scientific, Singapore, 1993).
- [67] M. Jeng, A. W. W. Ludwig, T. Senthil, and C. Chamon, “Interaction effects on quasiparticle localization in dirty superconductors,” *Bull. Am. Phys. Soc.* **46**, 231 (2001).
- [68] M. Jeng, A. W. W. Ludwig, T. Senthil, and C. Chamon, “Interaction effects on quasiparticle localization in dirty superconductors,” arXiv:cond-mat/0112044 (2001).
- [69] Luca Dell’Anna, “Disordered d-wave superconductors with interactions,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **758**, 255 (2006).
- [70] Yunxiang Liao, Alex Levchenko, and Matthew S. Foster, “Response theory of the ergodic many-body delocalized phase: Keldysh Finkel’stein sigma models and the 10-fold way,” *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **386**, 97 (2017).
- [71] A.M.M. Pruisken and I.S. Burmistrov, “The instanton vacuum of generalized CP^{N-1} models,” *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **316**, 285 (2005).
- [72] Y. Harashima and K. Slevin, “Effect of electron-electron interaction near the metal-insulator transition in doped semiconductors studied within the local density approximation,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **11**, 90 (2012).
- [73] K. Slevin and T. Ohtsuki, “Critical exponent for the Anderson transition in the three-dimensional orthogonal universality class,” *New J. Phys.* **16**, 015012 (2014).
- [74] M. Amini, V. E. Kravtsov, and M. Müller, “Multifractality and quantum-to-classical crossover in the Coulomb anomaly at the Mott–Anderson metal–insulator transition,” *New J. Phys.* **16**, 015022 (2014).
- [75] H.-J. Lee and K.-S. Kim, “Hartree-Fock study of the Anderson metal-insulator transition in the presence of Coulomb interaction: Two types of mobility edges and their multifractal scaling exponents,” *Phys. Rev. B* **97**, 155105 (2018).