

Strong non-linear response of strange metals

Serhii Kryhin,^{1,*} Subir Sachdev,^{1,†} and Pavel A. Volkov^{2,‡}

¹*Department of Physics, Harvard University, Cambridge MA 02138, USA*

²*Department of Physics, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT 06269, USA*

(Dated: July 24, 2024)

We show that nonlinear transport responses in strange metals are strong, larger by a factor of E_F/T than in Fermi liquids. Within the two-dimensional Yukawa-Sachdev-Ye-Kitaev model of a Fermi surface with a spatially random coupling to a critical scalar, the third order conductivity is found to diverge as $1/T$ at low T , indicating the existence of a voltage-temperature scaling regime in the conductance. Its frequency and orientation dependence contains information on relaxation times of heat and electron distribution deformations, providing a new set of tools to characterize strange metals.

Introduction. The strange metal state remains one of the most enigmatic phenomena in correlated electron systems. Both its microscopic origin and definitive set of characteristic behaviors remain under debate, calling for new probes and predictions. Recent advances in THz optics have opened the way to probe nonlinear transport properties of correlated electronic systems at frequencies relevant for the low-energy electronic phenomena. So far, these techniques have found applications in probing collective modes in superconductors [1–4], quantum spin systems [5–8] and strongly disordered semiconductors [9]. Metals remain relatively unexplored in this regard. Works on nonlinear optical conductivity in semiconductors [10–12] have identified that nonparabolicity of the band structure or energy dependence of scattering are necessary for any nonlinear response to be present (vanishing in Galilean invariant systems). In Fermi liquids, both effects are suppressed by the large value of the Fermi energy scale T_F , and thus the nonlinear response is expected to be weak.

In this work we demonstrate that strange metals, in contrast, should exhibit strong nonlinear transport responses. Using the recently proposed two-dimensional Yukawa-Sachdev-Ye-Kitaev (2d-YSYK) model [13, 14], we derive kinetic equations for non-equilibrium distributions of fermions and quantum critical bosons, allowing to treat the problem in presence of strong electric fields. The third order conductivity is found to be enhanced by T_F/T with respect to the Fermi liquid state (see Fig. 1) and a potential E/T scaling regime (where E is the electric field amplitude) in nonlinear transport is predicted to arise at low temperatures. General arguments allow to relate this enhancement to the linear in T resistivity, establishing strong non-linear responses as a robust property of strange metals, and we discuss applications to particular materials.

Model. To describe the strange metal, we use the 2d-YSYK model [13–19], which has been shown to reproduce the characteristic linear transport ($\rho \sim T$ down to zero) and thermodynamic $C \sim T \log[1/T]$ properties of strange metals. It contains N flavors of fermions ψ_i with an




FIG. 1. Predicted behavior of linear and non-linear conductivity in a strange metal around a QCP. As Δ is tuned to criticality, $\alpha_2(\Delta)$ grows until reaches the saturation at the order of T_F/T value at the critical point. This leads to a crossover from a Fermi liquid into strange metal both in linear and third order conductivities. Linear conductivity σ is displayed in the units of e^2/\hbar , third order conductivity $\sigma_Q^{(3)}$ is displayed in the units of $e^2/\hbar E_0^2$, where $E_0 = 2k_F^2 v_F/e$ is characteristic to the material electric field strength.

action S_ψ ,

$$S_\psi = \sum_{i=1}^N \int dt d\mathbf{r} \psi_i^\dagger [i\partial_t - \varepsilon(\hat{\mathbf{p}}) + \mu] \psi_i - \mathbf{j}_i \cdot \mathbf{A}, \quad (1)$$

where $j_i = e/2im \sum_i (\hat{\psi}_{i+}^\dagger \nabla \hat{\psi}_{i+} - \text{h.c.})$ is the current operator, \mathbf{A} is the vector potential, and $\varepsilon(p) \approx v_F(p - p_F)$ is the single-particle dispersion, coupled to N flavors of scalar bosons with an action S_ϕ ,

$$S_\phi = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \int dt d\mathbf{r} \left[\dot{\phi}_i^2 - c^2 (\nabla \phi_i)^2 - m^2 \phi_i^2 \right] \quad (2)$$

in two spatial dimensions. We assume the system at the QCP, such that the mass of the boson m is tuned to 0 at zero temperature [16]. The final two ingredients

we include are potential disorder for fermions, and the spatially disordered Yukawa coupling between fermions and bosons. Here we do not consider the effects of a uniform Yukawa coupling [17] (which cancels in perturbative computations of transport [13]) or random mass disorder for bosons (which is induced by the Yukawa coupling, and only important at very low T [20]). The action for fermion potential disorder S_v has the form

$$S_v = - \sum_{i,j} \int dt d\mathbf{r} \frac{v_{ij}(\mathbf{r})}{\sqrt{N}} \psi_i^\dagger(t, \mathbf{r}) \psi_j(t, \mathbf{r}) \quad (3)$$

with $v_{ij}(\mathbf{r}) = v_{ij}^*(\mathbf{r})$ and the fermion-boson interaction comes in the form of $S_{g'}$, where

$$S_{g'} = - \sum_{ijl} \int dt d\mathbf{r} \frac{cg'_{ijl}(\mathbf{r})}{N} \psi_i^\dagger(t, \mathbf{r}) \psi_j(t, \mathbf{r}) \phi_l(t, \mathbf{r}) \quad (4)$$

with $g'_{ijl}(\mathbf{r}) = g'_{ijl}(\mathbf{r})$. Disorder strength $v_{ij}(\mathbf{r})$ and coupling strength $g'_{ijl}(\mathbf{r})$ are random functions of space and particle flavor such that

$$\langle v_{ij}(\mathbf{r}) v_{nm}^*(\mathbf{r}') \rangle = v^2 \delta_{in} \delta_{jm} \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'), \quad (5)$$

$$\langle g'_{ijl}(\mathbf{r}) g'_{nms}(\mathbf{r}') \rangle = g'^2 \delta_{in} \delta_{jm} \delta_{ls} \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'). \quad (6)$$

The total action of the model S then can be written as

$$S[\psi, \psi^\dagger, \phi] = S_\psi + S_\phi + S_v + S_{g'}. \quad (7)$$

Previously, kinetic equations for similar models have been derived [19, 21] assuming the bosons to be in thermal equilibrium. As is shown below, this is sufficient to describe the linear response, since the bosons don't directly couple to electric field \mathbf{E} . In higher orders in \mathbf{E} , however, the boson distribution also changes, affecting the electronic responses. We address this challenge by deriving a self-consistent set of effective kinetic equations for the fermions and bosons in the Yukawa-SYK model using the Keldysh formalism in the closed time contour formulation [22] with “+” part going from $-\infty$ to $+\infty$ and “-” part vice versa.

Physical observables in the non-equilibrium field theory can be conveniently expressed via correlators of “+” and “-” fields. For example, the physical current operator

$$\hat{\mathbf{j}} \equiv \frac{e}{2imN} \sum_i \left[\hat{\psi}_{i+}^\dagger \nabla \hat{\psi}_{i+} - \nabla \hat{\psi}_{i+}^\dagger \hat{\psi}_{i+} \right] \quad (8)$$

can be expressed through a ‘lesser’ Green’s function $G^<(x, x') = \langle \psi_+(x) \psi_-^\dagger(x') \rangle$ (where $x = (\mathbf{r}, t)$) as

$$\langle \hat{\mathbf{j}}(t, \mathbf{r}) \rangle = - \frac{e}{2m} \lim_{\substack{t' \rightarrow t+0 \\ \mathbf{r}' \rightarrow \mathbf{r}}} \left[\nabla_{\mathbf{r}} G^<(x, x') - \nabla_{\mathbf{r}'} G^<(x, x') \right], \quad (9)$$

since $\langle \psi_+(x) \psi_+^\dagger(x') \rangle = G^<(x, x')$ for $t' > t$.

Since we are primarily interested in the low energy/wavelength behavior of the theory, we work with

a Wigner transform - a Fourier transform of $G^<(x, x')$ around the center of mass coordinate $(x + x')/2$ that we denote as $G^<((x + x')/2, \omega, \mathbf{k})$. We focus on the quasi-classical sources, thus focusing on the case of uniform electric field with sufficiently small frequency ($\nu \ll T$, see below). In equilibrium $G^<(\omega, \mathbf{k}) = -2i\bar{f}(\omega) \text{Im} G_R(\omega, \mathbf{k})$, where $\bar{f}(\omega)$ is the Fermi-Dirac distribution and $G_R(\omega, \mathbf{k})$ is the retarded Green’s function [19, 23]. Analogous statement is also true for the bosonic “lesser” Green’s function $D^<$ [24]. Motivated by these properties, we define the non-equilibrium “occupation number function” $f(x, \omega, \theta)$ as

$$f(x, \omega, \theta) = \frac{i}{2B_F} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{dk}{(2\pi)} G^<(x, \omega, \mathbf{k}), \quad (10)$$

where $B_F = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dk \text{Im} G_R(x, \omega, \mathbf{k})$. Angle θ defines direction of \mathbf{k} in the spatial plane. If the Fermi velocity of the system is large, the Green’s function G_R is highly peaked at $k = k_f$, making B_F a constant up to ω/E_F corrections [24]. In equilibrium, therefore, $f(x, \omega, \theta) = \bar{f}(\omega)$.

Equivalent construction is used to define the non-equilibrium “boson distribution”

$$f_B(x, \Omega, \theta) = - \frac{i}{2B(\Omega)} \int_0^{+\infty} c^2 dq d\mathbf{q} / 2\pi D^<(x, \Omega, \mathbf{q}), \quad (11)$$

where Ω is the boson energy and θ defines the direction of boson momentum, and $B = \int_0^{+\infty} c^2 dq d\mathbf{q} / 2\pi D_R(x, \Omega, \mathbf{q})$. Unlike the fermion case, quantity B ends up having non-trivial Ω dependence.

Kinetic equation. To derive the set of equations closed for f and f_B , we use the $\Sigma - G$ effective action method [16, 17] to obtain the equations for Green’s functions in the large- N limit, followed by a quasi-classical approximation developed in [23]. As neither bosonic or fermionic self-energies depend on absolute value of momentum [13, 16, 24], the equations can be integrated over k , yielding closed system for f (10) and f_B (11).

The equations of motion can be the most conveniently written with the use of angular harmonics f_m and f_{Bm} , $f = \sum_m f_m e^{i\theta m}$ and $f_B = \sum_m f_{Bm} e^{i\theta m}$. For $m \neq 0$ the result is (details in the supplement [24]):

$$\begin{aligned} [a(T)\partial_t + \Gamma_m + g(\omega, T) + \delta g[f_{B0}, f_0]] f_{m \neq 0} &= \\ &= \frac{ev_F}{2} \partial_\omega (\mathcal{E}^* f_{m-1} + \mathcal{E} f_{m+1}), \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where $\mathcal{E} = E_x + iE_y$, $\Gamma_{m \neq 0} = v^2 k_F / v_F$ is the relaxation rate associated with potential disorder. Below we will also discuss a more general case of Γ_m being not all equal, expected when the discrete lattice symmetry is taken into account. $g(\omega, T)$ corresponds to the relaxation rate due to interactions between electrons and bosons, when both are taken close to equilibrium. In the vicinity of the QCP (m^2 , Eq. (2), tuned to zero), $g = g_{\text{cr}} = \alpha_1 T (\gamma(T) +$

$\ln \text{ch}(\omega/2T)$), where $\alpha_1 = \frac{g'^2 k_F}{4\pi v_F}$ is the dimensionless coupling constant and $\gamma(T) = \ln(2/\pi) + \ln \ln(\Lambda_q^2 c^2/c_d T)$, $c\Lambda_q \sim T_F$ is almost constant apart from extremely low T (consistent with previous results [13, 16, 17, 19] and marginal Fermi liquid phenomenology [25]). In particular, at $\omega \gg T$, $g \sim |\omega|$ is a nonanalytic function. In addition, $a_{\text{cr}}(T) = 1 + \alpha_1 \ln(\Lambda_q^2 c^2/2\pi c_d T)/2\pi$ also shows a log divergence at the QCP. Away from the critical point $m^2 = \Delta^2$, Fermi liquid behavior is obtained: $g_{\text{FL}} = 3\alpha_2(T^2 + \omega^2/\pi^2)/4k_F v_F$ with $\alpha_2 = g'^2 k_F^2 c_d/6\Delta^2$, and the dynamic coefficient a_{FL} is constant at low T .

The non-equilibrium correction to the scattering rate δg depends only on $m = 0$ harmonics of f , f_B and takes the form [24]

$$\delta g[f_{B0}, f_0] = \frac{2g'^2 k_F}{v_F} \int \frac{d\Omega}{2\pi} (K_{\delta g}[f_{B0}, f_0] - K_{\delta g}[\bar{f}_B, \bar{f}]) \quad (13)$$

with $K_{\delta g}[f_{B0}, f_0] = B(\Omega)(f_{B0}(\Omega) - f_0(\omega - \Omega))$. The kinetic equation for f_0 is more complicated than for $m \neq 0$

$$a(T)\partial_t f_0 - I[f_{B0}, f_0] = \partial_\omega(\mathcal{E}^* f_{-1} + \mathcal{E} f_{+1}) \quad (14)$$

where

$$I[f_{B0}, f_0] = -g(\omega, T)(f_0 - \bar{f}) - (f_0 - 1/2)\delta g[f_{B0}, f_0] + \frac{g'^2 k_F}{2v_F} \int \frac{d\Omega}{2\pi} (K_{g'}[f_{B0}, f_0] - K_{g'}[\bar{f}_B, \bar{f}]), \quad (15)$$

and $K_{g'}[f_{B0}, f_0] = B(\Omega)(2f_{B0}(\Omega) + 1)(f_0(\omega + \Omega) + f_0(\omega - \Omega) - 1)$. Dynamics of the $m = 0$ harmonic involves the deviations from equilibrium of both fermions and bosons in an essential way and has to be included to obtain nonlinear responses. Note the absence of contribution of potential scattering to (14); this is due the $m = 0$ harmonic characterizing the change in energy of the system, so elastic scattering can not lead to its relaxation. For a closed system of fermions and bosons, one furthermore expects energy conservation to impose zero energy relaxation rate, as shown below.

The dynamics of boson distribution is dominated by the Landau damping such that the steady state f_B can be found explicitly [24]:

$$f_B = \bar{f}_B(\Omega) - \frac{\lambda c_d}{4\Omega} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\omega (K_B[f_0] - K_B[\bar{f}]), \quad (16)$$

where $K_B[f_0] = (1 - 2f_0(x, \omega + \Omega))(1 - 2f_0(x, \omega))$, and $\lambda = 1$ for the action above. Below we will also discuss the case of bosons remaining in equilibrium [19] (e.g. due to interactions with other degrees of freedom) by setting $\lambda = 0$.

Non-linear responses. We first analyze nonlinear conductivity perturbatively, solving Eqs. (12), (14), and (16) order by order in \mathbf{E} . In first order, \mathbf{E} generates $m = \pm 1$ angular harmonic from the initial \bar{f} in Eq. (12),




FIG. 2. Structure of perturbation theory for Eqs. (12,14) is displayed. First order involves only dipolar $m = \pm 1$ harmonics and leads to a linear contribution to current. Second order involves density $m = 0$ and quadrupolar $m = \pm 2$ deformations that do not contribute to current due to inversion symmetry. Both $m = 0$ and $m = \pm 2$ distortions serve as sources to generate $m = \pm 1$ distortions in third order, leading to a non-linear contribution to current.

$f_m^1(\omega, T) \propto E v_F \partial_\omega \frac{\bar{f}}{ia(T)\nu + \Gamma_m + g(\omega, T)} \delta_{m, \pm 1}$. From (9) and assuming $\Gamma_m \gg g(\omega, T)$ we get the result [13] for linear conductivity $\sigma(\nu, T) = \frac{e^2}{4\pi\hbar} \bar{W}_1(\nu, T)$, where

$$\bar{W}_k(\nu, T) = \frac{k_F v_F}{ia(T)\nu + \Gamma_k + \tilde{g}(T)}, \quad (17)$$

and $\tilde{g}(T) \approx \int d\omega \partial_\omega \bar{f} g(\omega, T)$. At the QCP $\tilde{g}_{\text{cr}} = \alpha_1 T \tilde{\gamma}(T)$, where $\tilde{\gamma}(T) = \gamma(T) + \ln(e/2)$, such that a linear in T corrections to resistivity is obtained. Away from the QCP, the Fermi liquid behavior $\tilde{g}_{\text{FL}} = \tilde{g}'_{\text{FL}} = \alpha_2 T^2/k_F v_F$ is recovered, where α_2 has been defined above.

In second order in electric field, Eqs. (12), (14) produce $m = \pm 2$ and $m = 0$ harmonics. Generally, the structure of these equations implies that in each next order, harmonics with $\delta m = \pm 1$ are generated (see Fig. 2). Most importantly, the n -th order correction to distribution function contains n derivatives with respect to ω , which can act on the nonanalytic (in the $T \rightarrow 0$ limit) $g(\omega)$, such that $f^{(n)}$ contains a part $\propto \partial^{n-1} g(\omega)$. We show below explicitly that this leads to singular behavior of observable non-linear responses.

Involvement of (14) warrants a separate discussion. The collision integral in (14) can be shown to possess an eigenstate [24] that depends on λ in Eq. (16). Generally, the result takes the form $f^{(2)} \propto W_0(\nu_{ij}, T) \frac{\partial}{\partial \omega} \left[W_1(\nu_i, \omega, T) \frac{\partial f(\omega)}{\partial \omega} \right]$ where $W_0(\nu, T) = \frac{k_F v_F}{i\nu a(T) + g_0(T, \lambda)}$ is independent of ω and related to the eigenvalue. For the actual model $\lambda = 1$, $g_0(T, \lambda = 1) = 0$, reflecting energy conservation. In this case, the 0-eigenvalue eigenfunction $\delta f_0 \sim \partial_T \bar{f}$, $\delta f_0 \sim \partial_T \bar{f}_B$, which corresponds to response to change of effective temperature (Joule heating). For bosons forced to be in thermal equilibrium $g_0(T, \lambda = 0) = \frac{g'^2 k_F}{4\pi v_F} T \sim g(\omega \sim T, T)$, much

stronger than what's expected for electron-phonon interactions [26].

No contribution to current is produced by the $f_{m=\pm 2,0}$ reflecting inversion symmetry, but they serve as sources for $m = \pm 1$ harmonics at order E^3 (Fig. 2). We can thus decompose the third-order current response into two contributions $\mathbf{j}_0^{(3)}$ and $\mathbf{j}_{\pm 2}^{(3)}$:

$$\mathbf{j}_{0,\pm 2}^{(3)} = -\frac{e^2}{4\pi\hbar} A_Q \sum_{ijl} \mathbf{E}_l \frac{(\mathbf{E}_j \cdot \mathbf{E}_i)}{E_0^2} \times \\ \times \tilde{W}_{0,\pm 2}(\nu_{ij}) \tilde{W}'(\nu_i) \tilde{W}''(\nu_{ijl}). \quad (18)$$

The main difference between the strange metal and the Fermi liquid comes in the numeric coefficient A_Q in front that determines the overall magnitude of the response. In case of strange metal $A_{Q,\text{cr}} = 2\alpha_1 k_F v_F / 3T \sim T_F / T$, while in a Fermi liquid one obtains $A_{Q,\text{FL}} = 3\alpha_2 / 2\pi^2 \sim 1$. At $T \ll T_F$ strange metal thus has a much stronger (by T_F / T) nonlinear response (Fig. 1), formally diverging as $T \rightarrow 0$.

The divergence of the third-order response in non-Fermi liquid suggests the breakdown of perturbation theory at low T . To understand this regime, we consider higher order terms in the perturbation theory to the set of kinetic equations in question. Examination of the structure of the perturbation series one can see that at the leading order in the limit of small temperature $\mathbf{j}^{(n)} \sim \mathbf{j}^{(n-2)} \mathbf{E}^2 / T^2$, where factor of T arises from additional derivatives of $g_{\text{cr}}(\omega/T)$ (and thus $\Sigma_R(\omega/T)$) over ω . This suggests a universal scaling of the temperature-dependent part of the total current (including all nonlinear currents) of the form

$$\mathbf{j}_{\text{tot}}(T) - \mathbf{j}_{\text{tot}}(0) = T^2 \mathbf{F} \left(\frac{\mathbf{E}}{T} \right). \quad (19)$$

This form has similarities to that found near quantum critical points of bosons [27, 28].

Discussion and Conclusions: The results presented above for the 2d-YSYK model can be reinforced with general arguments. In particular, the E_F / T enhancement can be understood for the nonlinear response arising from Joule heating ($m = 0$ harmonic taken at second order). The temperature change due to heating is $\Delta T \propto V^2 / (RC_{el})$, which leads to the nonlinear correction $R(T) \approx R(T_0) + R'(T) \Delta T$, such that $\Delta R \propto V^2$. This is the basis of the so-called 3ω method [29]. The difference between strange metal and Fermi liquid is reduced then to $R'(T)$ being constant (strange metal) or of the order T / T_F (Fermi liquid). However, the same difference between the Fermi liquid and strange metal appears also from the $m = \pm 2$ harmonic taken at second order that cannot be attributed to such a simple heating phenomenology and is also a general feature of strange metals. The argument above points to the intimate relation between inelastic scattering, temperature dependence of

resistivity and nonlinear responses (see Fig. 1). Since the conventional definition of strange metal is based on the second property, our work opens another perspective on studying this phenomenon.

Our results also highlight that nonlinear response contains much more information about the correlated electrons, than the linear one. In present model, scattering rates for all angular harmonics m are equivalent; however, this no longer holds when lattice symmetry is taken into account [24]. Instead, different scattering rates should be attributed to different irreducible representations of the point group. For example, for D_{4h} group appropriate for square lattice materials, such as cuprates, instead of $m = \pm 2$ Fermi surface deformations, there would be B_{1g} and B_{2g} ones, characterized by different scattering rates. Those scattering rates can be extracted from the frequency dependence of the third-order response, Eq. (18). The main obstacle on the way to successfully study these quadrupolar relaxation rates is that $\mathbf{j}_0^{(3)}$ is generally larger than $\mathbf{j}_{\pm 2}^{(3)}$, since the relaxation rate g_0 of the energy density is much smaller than the relaxation of quadrupolar harmonics Γ_2 . However, exploiting polarization dependence of the response can allow to isolate the quadrupolar part. Assuming x - and y - directions are chosen to be along the principal axes, \mathbf{E} applied along the axes would cause only B_{1g} -type quadrupolar response. When \mathbf{E} applied along diagonals, only B_{2g} -type quadrupolar response will be triggered. In both cases $\mathbf{j}_0^{(3)}, \mathbf{j}_{\pm 2}^{(3)} \parallel \mathbf{E}$, but only $\mathbf{j}_0^{(3)}$ would be the same, such that subtracting two results allows to isolate the quadrupolar-mediated part. Furthermore, when E is not directed along the main axes or diagonal, the component of $\mathbf{j}_{\pm 2}^{(3)}$ perpendicular to \mathbf{E} is solely quadrupolar-mediated (see Appendix IV in Supplemental Information [24] for full expressions).

Let us now discuss the application of our results to known strange metals. For cuprates, we estimate the non-linear conductivity not arising from heating for Bi-2212 assuming all $\Gamma_{m \neq 0}$ are equal with the set of parameters taken at $T \sim 40$ K: $\rho \sim 40 \mu\Omega \cdot \text{cm}$, $T_F \sim 2 \cdot 10^3$ K [30], $v_F \sim 3 \cdot 10^5$ m/s [31, 32], and $k_F \sim E_F / v_F$. We obtain $\sigma_J^{(3)} / \sigma^{(1)} \sim 10^{-10} A_Q (\text{V/m})^{-2}$. For a Fermi liquid $A_Q \sim 1$ with the same parameter, non-linear response becomes comparable to linear one at electric fields ~ 1000 V/cm, while for a non-Fermi liquid with $A_Q \sim T_F / T \sim 50$ only fields of strength 100 V/cm are required (see Appendix V in Supplemental Information [24] for details). In modern THz experiments, field strengths well in excess of that can be generated [33]. For pulsed field experiments, we can also estimate nonlinear response due to heating, assuming the energy of the pulse fully converted to heat. For a pulse of ~ 10 ps [34], specific heat $c \sim 50$ mJ/gK [35] and mass density $\rho_m \sim 6.5 \cdot 10^6$ g/m³ [36], we get $\sigma_J^{(3)} / \sigma^{(1)} \sim 10^{-12} (\text{V/m})^{-2}$, which can still be appreciable for fields ~ 10 kV/cm [33]. However, our estimate for

non-heating related nonlinear response is still larger in this case. An alternative setup may be DC pulse experiments [37] that will also allow to suppress superconductivity without the need for high magnetic field.

In conclusion, we demonstrated that a strong T_F/T enhancement of nonlinear responses is a characteristic feature of strange metals with respect to Fermi liquids. Our results suggest the existence of an E/T scaling behavior of nonlinear conductivity of strange metals at low temperatures. Third order responses in particular have been shown to contain information about relaxation time of quadrupolar distortions of the Fermi surface that can be deduced in experiments with controlled field orientation. Our estimates show that the predicted phenomena are well within reach of modern THz experiments.

Acknowledgements We acknowledge useful discussions with D. Natelson and E. Konig. We also acknowledge useful discussions with Haoyu Guo, in particular, pointing out the importance of non-linear terms in the kinetic equation [38]. This research was supported by the U.S. National Science Foundation grant No. DMR-2245246 and by the Simons Collaboration on Ultra-Quantum Matter which is a grant from the Simons Foundation (651440, S.S.).

* skryhin@g.harvard.edu

† sachdev@g.harvard.edu

‡ pavel.volkov@uconn.edu

- [1] R. Matsunaga, N. Tsuji, H. Fujita, A. Sugioka, K. Makise, Y. Uzawa, H. Terai, Z. Wang, H. Aoki, and R. Shimano, *Light-induced collective pseudospin precession resonating with higgs mode in a superconductor*, *Science* **345**, 1145 (2014).
- [2] R. Shimano and N. Tsuji, *Higgs mode in superconductors*, *Annual Review of Condensed Matter Physics* **11**, 103 (2020).
- [3] J. Y. Yuan, L. Y. Shi, L. Yue, B. H. Li, Z. X. Wang, S. X. Xu, T. Q. Xu, Y. Wang, Z. Z. Gan, F. C. Chen, Z. F. Lin, X. Wang, K. Jin, X. B. Wang, J. L. Luo, S. J. Zhang, Q. Wu, Q. M. Liu, T. C. Hu, R. S. Li, X. Y. Zhou, D. Wu, T. Dong, and N. L. Wang, *Revealing strong coupling of collective modes between superconductivity and pseudogap in cuprate superconductor by terahertz third harmonic generation*, arXiv e-prints [10.48550/arXiv.2211.06961](https://arxiv.org/abs/10.48550/arXiv.2211.06961) (2022), [arXiv:2211.06961](https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.06961) [cond-mat.supr-con].
- [4] A. G. Salvador, P. E. Dolgirev, M. H. Michael, A. Liu, D. Pavicevic, M. Fechner, A. Cavalleri, and E. Demler, *Principles of 2d terahertz spectroscopy of collective excitations: the case of josephson plasmons in layered superconductors* (2024), [arXiv:2401.05503](https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.05503) [cond-mat.supr-con].
- [5] Y. Wan and N. P. Armitage, *Resolving continua of fractional excitations by spinon echo in thz 2d coherent spectroscopy*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 257401 (2019).
- [6] S. Takayoshi, Y. Murakami, and P. Werner, *High-harmonic generation in quantum spin systems*, *Phys. Rev. B* **99**, 184303 (2019).
- [7] S. A. Parameswaran and S. Gopalakrishnan, *Asymptotically exact theory for nonlinear spectroscopy of random quantum magnets*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 237601 (2020).
- [8] W. Choi, K. H. Lee, and Y. B. Kim, *Theory of two-dimensional nonlinear spectroscopy for the kitaev spin liquid*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 117205 (2020).
- [9] F. Mahmood, D. Chaudhuri, S. Gopalakrishnan, R. Nandkishore, and N. P. Armitage, *Observation of a marginal Fermi glass*, *Nature Physics* **17**, 627 (2021).
- [10] K. C. Rustagi, *Effect of Carrier Scattering on Nonlinear Optical Susceptibility due to Mobile Carriers in InSb, InAs, and GaAs*, *Phys. Rev. B* **2**, 4053 (1970).
- [11] K. C. Rustagi, *Dispersion and polarization dependence of mobile carrier optical nonlinearities*, *Applied Physics Letters* **44**, 1121 (1984).
- [12] S. Y. Yuen and P. A. Wolff, *Difference-frequency variation of the free-carrier-induced, third-order nonlinear susceptibility in n-InSb*, *Applied Physics Letters* **40**, 457 (1982).
- [13] A. A. Patel, H. Guo, I. Esterlis, and S. Sachdev, *Universal theory of strange metals from spatially random interactions*, *Science* **381**, 790 (2023), [arXiv:2203.04990](https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.04990) [cond-mat.str-el].
- [14] C. Li, D. Valentinis, A. A. Patel, H. Guo, J. Schmalian, S. Sachdev, and I. Esterlis, *Strange metal and superconductor in the two-dimensional Yukawa-Sachdev-Ye-Kitaev model*, (2024), [arXiv:2406.07608](https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.07608) [cond-mat.str-el].
- [15] E. E. Aldape, T. Cookmeyer, A. A. Patel, and E. Altman, *Solvable theory of a strange metal at the breakdown of a heavy Fermi liquid*, *Phys. Rev. B* **105**, 235111 (2022), [arXiv:2012.00763](https://arxiv.org/abs/2012.00763) [cond-mat.str-el].
- [16] I. Esterlis, H. Guo, A. A. Patel, and S. Sachdev, *Large-N theory of critical Fermi surfaces*, *Phys. Rev. B* **103**, 235129 (2021), [arXiv:2103.08615](https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.08615) [cond-mat.str-el].
- [17] H. Guo, A. A. Patel, I. Esterlis, and S. Sachdev, *Large-N theory of critical Fermi surfaces. II. Conductivity*, *Phys. Rev. B* **106**, 115151 (2022), [arXiv:2207.08841](https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.08841) [cond-mat.str-el].
- [18] H. Guo, D. Valentinis, J. Schmalian, S. Sachdev, and A. A. Patel, *Cyclotron resonance and quantum oscillations of critical Fermi surfaces*, *Phys. Rev. B* **109**, 075162 (2024), [arXiv:2308.01956](https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.01956) [cond-mat.str-el].
- [19] A. Nikolaenko, S. Sachdev, and A. A. Patel, *Theory of shot noise in strange metals*, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **5**, 043143 (2023).
- [20] A. A. Patel, P. Lunts, and S. Sachdev, *Localization of overdamped bosonic modes and transport in strange metals*, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science* **121**, e2402052121 (2024), [arXiv:2312.06751](https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.06751) [cond-mat.str-el].
- [21] A. A. Patel, J. McGreevy, D. P. Arovas, and S. Sachdev, *Magnetotransport in a model of a disordered strange metal*, *Phys. Rev. X* **8**, 021049 (2018).
- [22] A. Kamenev, *Field Theory of Non-Equilibrium Systems* (Cambridge University Press, 2011).
- [23] C. P. Nave and P. A. Lee, *Transport properties of a spinon Fermi surface coupled to a U(1) gauge field*, *Phys. Rev. B* **76**, 235124 (2007).
- [24] Supplemental Information for ‘Strong non-linear responses in strange metals’.
- [25] C. M. Varma, P. B. Littlewood, S. Schmitt-Rink, E. Abrahams, and A. E. Ruckenstein, *Phenomenology of the normal state of cu-o high-temperature superconductors*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **63**, 1996 (1989).

- [26] P. B. Allen, *Theory of thermal relaxation of electrons in metals*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **59**, 1460 (1987).
- [27] A. G. Green and S. L. Sondhi, *Nonlinear Quantum Critical Transport and the Schwinger Mechanism for a Superfluid-Mott-Insulator Transition of Bosons*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 267001 (2005).
- [28] A. M. Berridge and A. G. Green, *Nonequilibrium conductivity at quantum critical points*, *Phys. Rev. B* **88**, 220512 (2013), [arXiv:1312.4432 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [29] D. G. Cahill and R. O. Pohl, *Thermal conductivity of amorphous solids above the plateau*, *Phys. Rev. B* **35**, 4067 (1987).
- [30] A. Legros, S. Benhabib, W. Tabiś, F. Laliberté, M. Dion, M. Lizaire, B. Vignolle, D. Vignolles, H. Raffy, Z. Li, P. Auban-Senzier, N. Doiron-Leyraud, P. Fournier, D. Colson, L. Taillefer, and C. Proust, *Universal T-linear resistivity and Planckian dissipation in overdoped cuprates*, *Nature Physics* **15** (2019), [arXiv:1805.02512 \[cond-mat.supr-con\]](#).
- [31] I. M. Vishik, W. S. Lee, F. Schmitt, B. Moritz, T. Sasagawa, S. Uchida, K. Fujita, S. Ishida, C. Zhang, T. P. Devereaux, and Z. X. Shen, *Doping-dependent nodal fermi velocity of the high-temperature superconductor $\text{Bi}_2\text{Sr}_2\text{CaCu}_2\text{O}_{8+\delta}$ revealed using high-resolution angle-resolved photoemission spectroscopy*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 207002 (2010).
- [32] J. Hwang, *Superconducting coherence length of hole-doped cuprates obtained from electron-boson spectral density function*, *Scientific Reports* **11**, 11668 (2021).
- [33] K. Katsumi, J. Fiore, M. Udina, R. Romero, D. Barbalas, J. Jesudasan, P. Raychaudhuri, G. Seibold, L. Benfatto, and N. P. Armitage, *Revealing novel aspects of light-matter coupling by terahertz two-dimensional coherent spectroscopy: The case of the amplitude mode in superconductors*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **132**, 256903 (2024).
- [34] D. Barbalas, R. R. III, D. Chaudhuri, F. Mahmood, H. P. Nair, N. J. Schreiber, D. G. Schlom, K. M. Shen, and N. P. Armitage, *Energy relaxation and dynamics in the correlated metal Sr_2RuO_4 via thz two-dimensional coherent spectroscopy* (2023), [arXiv:2312.13502 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [35] C. S. Myers, M. A. Susner, L. Motowidlo, J. Distin, M. D. Sumption, and E. W. Collings, *Specific heats of composite Bi2212 , Nb_3Sn , and MgB_2 wire conductors*, *IEEE Transactions on Applied Superconductivity* **23**, 8800204 (2013).
- [36] *Bi-2212 ($\text{Sr}_2\text{CaCu}_2\text{Bi}_2\text{O}_8$) Crystal Structure: Datasheet from "PAULING FILE Multinaries Edition – 2022" in SpringerMaterials.*
- [37] M. N. Kunchur, *Current-induced pair breaking in magnesium diboride*, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **16**, R1183 (2004).
- [38] H. Guo, *Fluctuation Spectrum of Critical Fermi Surfaces*, (2024), [arXiv:2406.12967 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).

Supplemental Information for 'Strong non-linear response of strange metals'

Serhii Kryhin,^{1,*} Pavel A. Volkov,^{2,†} and Subir Sachdev^{1,‡}

¹*Department of Physics, Harvard University, Cambridge MA 02138, USA*

²*Department of Physics, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT 06269, USA*

(Dated: July 22, 2024)

I. LARGE- N EXPANSION OF THE YUKAWA-SYK MODEL IN THE KELDYSH FIELD THEORY

To derive the self-consistent large- N expansion in the Yukawa-SYK model of interest, we adopt a routine procedure previously described in [1–3] for Matsubara field theory. We average over the ensemble of gaussian-distributed random disorder $v_{ij}(\mathbf{r})$ and random coupling $g_{ijl}(\mathbf{r})$ with the averages and variances given by

$$\langle v_{ij}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle = 0, \quad (1)$$

$$\langle g_{ijl}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle = 0, \quad (2)$$

$$\langle v_{ij}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle = \langle g'_{ijl}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle = 0, \quad (3)$$

$$\langle v_{ij}^*(\mathbf{r}) v_{ab}(\mathbf{r}') \rangle = v^2 \delta_{ia} \delta_{jb} \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'), \quad (4)$$

$$\langle g_{ijl}^*(\mathbf{r}) g_{abc}^*(\mathbf{r}') \rangle = g'^2 \delta_{ia} \delta_{jb} \delta_{lc} \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'), \quad (5)$$

where the averaging for any observable f is done by

$$\langle f \rangle = \int D[v, g'] f(v, g') e^{-2 \sum_{i \leq j} \frac{|v_{ij}|^2(\mathbf{r})}{v^2}} e^{-2 \sum_{i \leq j} \frac{2|g'_{ijl}|^2(\mathbf{r})}{g'^2}}. \quad (6)$$

Following the usual procedure of $\Sigma - G$ method [1–3], we average over the partition function Z of the original theory given by

$$Z = \int D[\psi_{\pm}, \psi_{\pm}^{\dagger}, \phi_{\pm}] e^{iS_{\text{tot}}}, \quad (7)$$

where S_{tot} is given by Eq. 8 in the main text. Averaging over the random variable ensemble for Z results in

$$\begin{aligned} \langle Z \rangle = & \int D[\psi^{\dagger}, \psi, \phi] e^{iS_{\psi} + iS_{\psi}} \times \\ & \times \exp \left[-\frac{v^2}{2N} \sum_{ij} \int dx dx' \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \psi_{\alpha i}^{\dagger} \psi_{\beta j}(x) \psi_{\mu j}^{\dagger} \psi_{\nu i}(x') \delta_{F, \alpha\beta} \delta_{F, \mu\nu} \right] \times \\ & \times \exp \left[-\frac{g'^2 c^2}{2N^2} \sum_{ijl} \int dx dx' \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \psi_{\alpha i}^{\dagger} \psi_{\beta j} \phi_{\lambda l}(x) \psi_{\mu j}^{\dagger} \psi_{\nu i} \phi_{\rho l}(x') \tilde{\delta}_{\alpha\beta\lambda} \tilde{\delta}_{\mu\nu\rho} \right], \quad (8) \end{aligned}$$

where we introduced the new notation as following. We denote the \pm time contour index as a Greek index: field $\psi_{i+} = \psi_{i1}$, and $\psi_{i-} = \psi_{i2}$. The coefficients $\tilde{\delta}_{F, \alpha\beta}$ and $\tilde{\delta}_{\alpha\beta\rho}$ are

$$\tilde{\delta}_{F, \alpha\beta} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}_{\alpha\beta} \quad \tilde{\delta}_{\alpha\beta 1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \tilde{\delta}_{\alpha\beta 2} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (9)$$

To reproduce Eq. 8 of the main text.

* skryhin@g.harvard.edu

† pavel.volkov@uconn.edu

‡ sachdev@g.harvard.edu

We proceed by defining bilocal in spacetime fields $G_{\alpha\beta}(x, x')$ and $D_{\rho\lambda}(x, x')$ as

$$iG_{\alpha\beta}(x, x') = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \psi_{\alpha i}(x) \psi_{\beta i}^\dagger(x'), \quad (10)$$

$$iD_{\rho\lambda}(x, x') = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \phi_{\rho i}(x) \phi_{\lambda i}(x'), \quad (11)$$

where $x = (t, \mathbf{r})$. This definition is consistent with the definition of Green's functions in real time up to averages. We can now decouple the interaction terms in the action, Eq.(8) by introducing Lagrange multipliers $\Sigma_{\alpha\beta}(x, x')$ and $\Pi_{\alpha\beta}(x, x')$ via $\int D[\Sigma] \exp \left[-i\Sigma \left(iG - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \psi_{\alpha i}(x) \psi_{\beta i}^\dagger(x') \right) \right] = \delta \left[-i\Sigma \left(iG - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \psi_{\alpha i}(x) \psi_{\beta i}^\dagger(x') \right) \right]$. The transformation leads to an action quadratic in ψ and ϕ . Integrating out the original fields results in effective action (note that we work in 2 + 1 dimensions so $\int d^3x$ is over both space and time):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{S_{\text{eff}}}{N} = & -i \text{Tr} \ln (G_0^{-1} - \Sigma) + \frac{i}{2} \text{Tr} \ln (D_0^{-1} - \Pi) \\ & + i \int d^3x d^3x' \left(\frac{1}{2} \Pi_{\lambda\rho}(x', x) D_{\rho\lambda}(x, x') - \Sigma_{\alpha\beta}(x', x) G_{\beta\alpha}(x, x') \right) \\ & + \frac{iv^2}{2} \int d^3x d^3x' \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \tilde{\delta}_{F,\alpha\beta} \tilde{\delta}_{F,\mu\nu} G_{\nu\alpha}(x', x) G_{\beta\mu}(x, x') \\ & - \frac{c^2 g'^2}{2} \int d^3x d^3x' \tilde{\delta}_{\alpha\beta\rho} \tilde{\delta}_{\mu\nu\lambda} G_{\nu\alpha}(x', x) G_{\beta\mu}(x, x') D_{\rho\lambda}(x, x'). \quad (12) \end{aligned}$$

This expression consists of several parts. The traces in the first line of Eq. (12) come from integrating out the fields ψ and ϕ . The expressions for $G_{0,\alpha\beta}$ and $D_{0,\rho\lambda}$ are the corresponding bare fermion and boson Green's functions of our model. The terms with "self-energies" Σ and Π arise from the Lagrange multiplier term. The term in the third line corresponds to the potential disorder, and finally, the last line corresponds to the interaction averaged over disorder realizations.

Since the whole action is proportional to N , we apply a large- N expansion that leads to the equations of motion for fields G, D, Σ , and Π for the action that correspond to the saddle point of the action in Eq. (12).

Varying over the self-energies results in the Dyson equations

$$G_{\alpha\beta}(x, x') = \left[(G_0^{-1} - \Sigma)^{-1} \right]_{\alpha\beta}(x, x'), \quad (13)$$

$$D_{\rho\lambda}(x, x') = \left[(D_0^{-1} - \Pi)^{-1} \right]_{\rho\lambda}(x, x'). \quad (14)$$

Varying the action over G results in

$$i\Sigma_{\alpha\beta}(x, x') = i\Sigma_{v,\alpha\beta}(x, x') + i\Sigma_{g',\alpha\beta}(x, x'), \quad (15)$$

The corresponding v and g' contributions are

$$i\Sigma_{v,\alpha\beta}(x, x') = iv^2 \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \tilde{\delta}_{\alpha\mu} \tilde{\delta}_{\nu\beta} G_{\mu\nu}(x, x') \quad (16)$$

$$i\Sigma_{g',\alpha\beta}(x, x') = -\frac{c^2 g'^2}{2} \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \tilde{\delta}_{\alpha\nu\rho} \tilde{\delta}_{\mu\beta\lambda} G_{\nu\mu}(x, x') (D_{\rho\lambda}(x, x') + D_{\lambda\rho}(x', x)). \quad (17)$$

Varying over D results in

$$i\Pi_{\lambda\rho}(x, x') = c^2 g'^2 \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \tilde{\delta}_{\alpha\beta\rho} \tilde{\delta}_{\mu\nu\lambda} G_{\nu\alpha}(x, x') G_{\beta\mu}(x', x). \quad (18)$$

The Eqs (15) and (18) correspond to 1-loop self-consistent large- N expansion in the Keldysh theory. These results are used to construct a system of kinetic equations that would describe $v - g'$ model, but first a Keldysh rotation needs to be performed.

We construct a Keldysh rotation in a manner similar to the method employed by Kamenev in [4]. We define the Keldysh rotation for bosons by a transformation of the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} \phi_1 \\ \phi_2 \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \phi_+ \\ \phi_- \end{bmatrix} = \Lambda \begin{bmatrix} \phi_+ \\ \phi_- \end{bmatrix}. \quad (19)$$

The Keldysh rotation for fermions is defined in a more complicated but consistent with literature manner, since hermitian conjugated fields transform differently from their counterparts:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \psi_1 \\ \psi_2 \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \psi_+ \\ \psi_- \end{bmatrix} = U \begin{bmatrix} \psi_+ \\ \psi_- \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} \psi_1^\dagger \\ \psi_2^\dagger \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \psi_+^\dagger \\ \psi_-^\dagger \end{bmatrix} = V \begin{bmatrix} \psi_+^\dagger \\ \psi_-^\dagger \end{bmatrix}. \quad (20)$$

The Keldysh rotation defined by matrices U , V , and Λ naturally induces the Keldysh rotation for the Green's functions $G_{\alpha\beta}$ and $D_{\rho\lambda}$ defined by Eqs. (10) and (11). Since the Keldysh rotation is nearly a basis change for the fields, the action S_{eff} has to be invariant under the rotation. In turn, this naturally induces the transformation for $\Sigma_{\alpha\beta}$ and $\Pi_{\rho\lambda}$.

If the theory is self-consistent, the four components of the Green's function matrix are linearly dependent. Keldysh rotation is designed to explicitly eliminate one of the components by a change of basis. With our choice of the rotation in Eqs. (19) and (20) we expect the structure of the Green's functions after Keldysh rotation to be

$$G_{\alpha\beta} = \begin{bmatrix} G_R & G_K \\ 0 & G_A \end{bmatrix} \quad (21)$$

for fermions and

$$D_{\rho\lambda} = \begin{bmatrix} D_K & D_R \\ D_A & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (22)$$

for bosons. Thus in a self-consistent theory we expect $G_{21} = D_{22} = 0$ after a Keldysh rotation, which we will self-consistently check in the derivation process. Green's functions G_R and D_R are the retarded Green's functions, and G_A and D_A are advanced Green's functions, and G_K and D_K are Keldysh Green's functions.

With the structures in Eqs. (21) and (22), the explicit expressions for the components of bosonic self-energies can be written as

$$\Pi_R = \Pi_{21} = -i \frac{g'^2 c^2}{2} \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') [G_R(x, x') G_K(x', x) + G_K(x, x') G_A(x', x)] \quad (23)$$

$$\Pi_A = \Pi_{12} = -i \frac{g'^2 c^2}{2} \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') [G_A(x, x') G_K(x', x) + G_K(x, x') G_R(x', x)] \quad (24)$$

$$\Pi_K = \Pi_{22} = -i \frac{g'^2 c^2}{2} \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') [G_K(x, x') G_K(x', x) + G_A(x, x') G_R(x', x) + G_R(x, x') G_A(x', x)] \quad (25)$$

$$\Pi_{11} = -i \frac{g'^2 c^2}{2} \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') [G_A(x, x') G_A(x', x) + G_R(x, x') G_R(x', x)] \quad (26)$$

The corresponding fermionic self-energies are

$$\Sigma_{R,g'} = \Sigma_{11,g'} = i \frac{g'^2 c^2}{4} \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') [(D_K(x, x') + D_K(x', x)) G_R(x, x') + (D_R(x, x') + D_A(x', x)) G_K(x, x')] \quad (27)$$

$$\Sigma_{A,g'} = \Sigma_{22,g'} = i \frac{g'^2 c^2}{4} \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') [(D_K(x, x') + D_K(x', x)) G_A(x, x') + (D_A(x, x') + D_R(x', x)) G_K(x, x')] \quad (28)$$

$$\Sigma_{K,g'} = \Sigma_{12,g'} = i \frac{g'^2 c^2}{4} \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') [(D_K(x, x') + D_K(x', x)) G_K(x, x') + \quad (29)$$

$$+ (D_R(x, x') + D_A(x', x)) G_R(x, x') + (D_A(x, x') + D_R(x', x)) G_A(x, x')] \quad (30)$$

$$\Sigma_{21,g'} = i \frac{g'^2 c^2}{4} [(D_R(x, x') + D_A(x', x)) G_A(x, x') + (D_A(x, x') + D_R(x', x)) G_R(x, x')] \quad (31)$$

If the theory is self-consistent, we should see $\Pi_{11} = \Sigma_{21} = 0$ in the process of evaluating the expressions in Eqs. (23) - (31). The resulting equations are the self-consistent equations for the large- N expansion of the SYK model and can be used as ordinary input into the Keldysh field theory methods.

II. DERIVATION OF KINETIC EQUATION

Before constructing kinetic equations itself, we first for the sake of completeness define and showcase the basic useful properties for the derivation properties of the Wigner transform. We are interested in studying the quasi-classical limit of the theory, and therefore, instead of studying functions $A(x, x')$, we would like to focus on the dependence on

the "center of mass" coordinate $x + x'$. We assume that all the 2-point functions in the theory are slow-varying with the change of $(x + x')/2$ and fast-varying with the change of $(x - x')/2$. It is useful to define a Fourier-transformed in the $x - x'$ degree of freedom quantity as

$$A(x, p) = \int d^3 \tilde{x} e^{-ip \cdot \tilde{x}} A\left(x + \frac{\tilde{x}}{2}, x - \frac{\tilde{x}}{2}\right) \quad (32)$$

and study it instead of an original 2-point function. In the equation above p is a shorthand notation for a pair $p = (\omega, \mathbf{k})$ similar to $x = (t, \mathbf{r})$, and $p \cdot \tilde{x} = -\omega \tilde{t} + \mathbf{k} \tilde{\mathbf{r}}$. During the derivation of equations that govern Keldysh Green's functions and self-energies we have encountered two operations: one of them is a product of two functions and another is a convolution. The product of two bilocal functions $A(x, x')$ and $B(x, x')$, when Wigner transformed, leads to equations similar to the loop integrals in ordinary quantum field theory:

$$[C(x, x')](x, \Omega, \mathbf{k}) \equiv [A(x, x')B(x', x)](x, \Omega, \mathbf{k}) = \int \frac{d^3 p_B}{(2\pi)^3} A(x, \Omega + \Omega_B, \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}_B) B(x, \Omega_B, \mathbf{k}_B), \quad (33)$$

$$[C(x, x')](x, \Omega, \mathbf{k}) \equiv [A(x, x')B(x, x')](x, \Omega, \mathbf{k}) = \int \frac{d^3 p_B}{(2\pi)^3} A(x, \Omega - \Omega_B, \mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_B) B(x, \Omega_B, \mathbf{k}_B). \quad (34)$$

In the equations above the rectangular brackets denote the Wigner transform, and $p_B = (\Omega_B, \mathbf{k}_B)$. The second operation in real space, the convolution, can be formally defined as

$$C(x, x') \equiv (A \circ B)(x, x') = \int d^3 y A(x, y) B(y, x'). \quad (35)$$

In Section I of Supplemental Information we implicitly encounter this operation in Eqs. (13) and (14), because the inverse operation in those equations is formally defined as an inverse with respect to the convolution defined in Eq. (35), similar to ordinary field theory in real space. The Wigner transform of the convolution, in fact, involves infinite series, however in the quasi-classical limit the series can be truncated to

$$(A \circ B)(x, p) \approx A(x, p) B(x, p) + \frac{i}{2} \left(\frac{\partial A}{\partial x} \frac{\partial B}{\partial p} - \frac{\partial A}{\partial p} \frac{\partial B}{\partial x} \right) \quad (36)$$

Eq. (36) is the central approximation of the theory that limits the applicability of the theory to the large wavelength and small frequency perturbations, since it involves the infinite series truncation under assumption that the higher order terms in the series are small.

In this paper we are interested in non-linear conductivity, and thus a current density expectation value \mathbf{j} . In Keldysh field theory every physical observable is obtained by the operator insertions on the forward in time contour, thus with the "+" operators. The expectation for the current j can be written as

$$\langle \hat{j}(t, \mathbf{r}) \rangle \equiv \langle \hat{j}_{++}(t, \mathbf{r}) \rangle = \frac{e}{2imN} \sum_i \left[\hat{\psi}_{i+}^\dagger(t, \mathbf{r}) \nabla \hat{\psi}_{i+}(t, \mathbf{r}) - \nabla \hat{\psi}_{i+}^\dagger(t, \mathbf{r}) \hat{\psi}_{i+}(t, \mathbf{r}) \right], \quad (37)$$

which can be rewritten through a "lesser" Green's function $G^<(x, x') = (G_K(x, x') - G_R(x, x') + G_A(x, x'))/2$

$$\langle \hat{j}(t, \mathbf{r}) \rangle = -\frac{e}{2m} \lim_{\substack{t' \rightarrow t \\ \mathbf{r}' \rightarrow \mathbf{r}}} [\nabla_{\mathbf{r}} G^<(x, x') - \nabla_{\mathbf{r}'} G^<(x, x')], \quad (38)$$

instead of G_{++} , since $G_{++}(x, x') = \theta(t - t') G^>(x, x') + \theta(t' - t) G^<(x, x')$.

if the "++" component of the Green's function is written through the degrees of freedom in Keldysh basis. Performing the Wigner transform leads to

$$\langle \hat{j}(t, \mathbf{r}) \rangle = -ie \int \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \int \frac{d^2 k}{(2\pi)^2} \mathbf{v}_F G^<(t, \mathbf{r}, \omega, \mathbf{k}). \quad (39)$$

To proceed, forward from here, we would like to establish the intuition for the choice of function $f(x, \omega, \theta)$ from the main text in more detail. In general, the thermal equilibrium expressions for a lesser Green's functions $G^<$ and $D^<$ according to Keldysh field theory are completely fixed by the structure of G_R and D_R correspondingly and are given by

$$G^<(\omega, \mathbf{k}) = -\bar{f}(\omega)(G_R(\omega, \mathbf{k}) - G_A(\omega, \mathbf{k})), \quad \bar{f}(\omega) = \frac{1}{e^{\beta\omega} + 1}, \quad (40)$$

$$D^<(\Omega, \mathbf{q}) = \bar{f}_B(\Omega)(D_R(\Omega, \mathbf{q}) - D_A(\Omega, \mathbf{q})), \quad \bar{f}_B(\Omega) = \frac{1}{e^{\beta\Omega} - 1}. \quad (41)$$

According to [5, 6], it is possible to define a quantity in Keldysh field theory that would play a role of an analog of occupation number in the free theory even when the notion of the quasiparticle is suppressed by damping. The conditions for the definition consistent being: self-energies independent from momentum and presence of a sharp Fermi surface. The presence of a sharp Fermi-surface is required for a presence of a relatively sharp spectral density peak, while the independence of self-energies of momentum is required to make the system of kinetic equations being closed under the new "occupation numbers". From the calculations in thermal field theory in [1–3] we know that the structure of the thermal, and thus by analytic continuation, equilibrium retarded Green's functions takes a form

$$\bar{G}_R(\omega, \mathbf{k}) = \frac{1}{\omega - v_F k - \mathbf{v}_F \cdot \mathbf{A} - \Sigma_R(\omega)}, \quad \bar{D}_R(\Omega, \mathbf{q}) = \frac{1}{\Omega^2 - c^2 q^2 - m^2 + i c_d \Omega}. \quad (42)$$

The parameter v_F is a Fermi velocity, $\Sigma_R(\omega)$ - momentum independent self-energy roughly independent of ω at small ω , $c \lesssim v_F$ - boson velocity, m - boson thermal mass, and $c_d = g'^2 c^2 k_F^2 / 4\pi v_F^2$ - self-consistent Landau damping. The expressions above assumes a linearized dispersion of the fermion band in the vicinity of the Fermi surface. Interestingly, in this model even away from equilibrium the self-energies for boson and fermion don't depend on the momentum, which allows us to define

$$f(x, \omega, \theta_{\mathbf{k}}) = \frac{\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{k_F dk}{2\pi} G^<(x, \omega, \mathbf{k})}{-2i \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{k_F dk}{2\pi} \text{Im} G_R(x, \omega, \mathbf{k})}, \quad f_B(x, \Omega, \theta_{\mathbf{q}}) = \frac{\int_0^{+\infty} \frac{c^2 q dq}{2\pi} D^<(x, \Omega, \mathbf{q})}{2i \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{c^2 q dq}{2\pi} \text{Im} D_R(x, \Omega, \mathbf{q})}, \quad (43)$$

where $\theta_{\mathbf{k}}$ and $\theta_{\mathbf{q}}$ are the angles that define the direction of \mathbf{k} and \mathbf{q} correspondingly. Substituting Eqs. (42) into the definition of f and f_B leads us to

$$f(x, \omega, \theta_{\mathbf{k}}) = -i \frac{v_F}{k_F} \int \frac{k_F dk}{(2\pi)} G^<(x, \omega, \mathbf{k}), \quad f_B(x, \Omega, \theta_{\mathbf{q}}) = \frac{i}{2} \frac{1}{B(x, \Omega, \theta_{\mathbf{q}})} \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{c^2 q dq}{2\pi} D^<(x, \Omega, \mathbf{q}), \quad (44)$$

with $B(\Omega)$ being proportional to the momentum integrated spectral density

$$B(x, \Omega, \theta_{\mathbf{q}}) = - \int \frac{c^2 q dq}{2\pi} \text{Im} D_R(x, \Omega, q). \quad (45)$$

From the expressions above we can instantly see the importance of the sharp Fermi surface requirement: the generalized fermionic distribution f is just proportional to the integral of a lesser Green's function $G^<$ with a coefficient that is just a density of states at the Fermi surface regardless of the perturbation. Meanwhile, the generalized bosonic distribution function f_B has a complicated function modifying the integral of $D^<$. Below we will show that D_R stays unperturbed from equilibrium value at least in perturbation theory, thus B is independent from x and $\theta_{\mathbf{q}}$. However, the non-trivial dependence on Ω will remain the feature of the theory. Note that we only used Eqs. (40) and (41) as an inspiration for constructing f and f_B in such a way that they coincide with bosonic and fermionic equilibrium distributions when the system is in thermal equilibrium. As a consistency check of the theory, this fact will be explicitly proven below. Therefore, in all the calculation below we will treat $\bar{f}(\omega)$ and $\bar{f}_B(\Omega)$ as equilibrium expressions for f and f_B without assuming any explicit form.

It is useful to re-express the fermionic and bosonic non-equilibrium self-energy expressions obtained in Eqs. (23) - (31) with the use of f and f_B . We start from bosonic self-energies Π_R , Π_A , Π_K , and Π_{11} . After performing a Wigner transform to Eqs. (23) - (26) and substituting Eq. (44) into the result we obtain

$$\Pi_R(x, \omega) = -i \frac{g'^2 k_F^2}{v_F^2} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} [f(x, \omega, \theta) - f(x, \omega + \Omega, \theta)] \quad (46)$$

$$\Pi_A(x, \omega) = i \frac{g'^2 k_F^2}{v_F^2} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} [f(x, \omega, \theta) - f(x, \omega + \Omega, \theta)] \quad (47)$$

$$\Pi_K(x, \omega) = i \frac{g'^2 k_F^2}{2v_F^2} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \frac{d\theta'}{2\pi} [(1 - 2f(x, \omega + \Omega, \theta))(1 - 2f(x, \omega, \theta')) - 1]. \quad (48)$$

The expression for Π_K has two momentum angles θ and θ' decoupled due to spatially randomized coupling, which averages out the interaction of all but density harmonics. The expression for Π_{11} reads

$$\Pi_{11}(x, \Omega) = -i \frac{g'^2 c^2}{2} \int \frac{d^2 k}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{d^2 k'}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} [G_A(x, \omega + \Omega, \mathbf{k}) G_A(x, \omega, \mathbf{k}') + G_R(x, \omega + \Omega, \mathbf{k}) G_R(x, \omega, \mathbf{k}')] = 0, \quad (49)$$

because the poles of the products of two retarded and two advanced Green's functions have poles only on one side of the contour. Therefore, correct bosonic field causality structure is preserved and expressions for bosonic field are so far self-consistent.

Before considering fermionic self-energies, we will detour to understand the structure of the bosonic self energies better. First of all, we expect the total number of fermions N_F to be unchanged by external perturbations. The total fermion number can be expressed as

$$N_F = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \int d^2 \mathbf{r} \langle \psi_{i+}^\dagger(t, \mathbf{r}) \psi_{i+}(t, \mathbf{r}) \rangle = \int d^2 \mathbf{r} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} f(x, \omega, \theta). \quad (50)$$

Since in this work we resort only to spatially homogeneous fields, appearance of the charge redistribution in space is not expected and function f is independent of \mathbf{r} . Since the charged particle density remains constant in space, one can express charge conservation as

$$\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} (f(x, \omega, \theta) - \bar{f}(\omega)) = 0 \quad (51)$$

Thus, expression for $\Pi_R(t, \Omega)$ will be equal to the equilibrium expression $\bar{\Pi}_R(\Omega)$, because using Eq. (51) it can be rewritten as as

$$\Pi_R(x, \omega) = -i \frac{g'^2 k_F^2}{v_F^2} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} [\bar{f}(\omega) - \bar{f}(\omega + \Omega)] = \bar{\Pi}_R(\Omega) = -ic_d \Omega, \quad (52)$$

where $\bar{\Pi}_R$ is obtained by analytic continuation from thermal field theory in previous works. Assuming $\bar{f}(\omega) = 1/(e^{\beta\omega} + 1)$, the value of the integral is consistent with the thermal field theory expression for $c_d = g'^2 c^2 k_F^2 / 4\pi v_F^2$. Since bosonic self-energy remains uncorrected by non-equilibrium effects, the thermal mass m^2 and retarded bosonic Green's function D_R will also be equal to their equilibrium expressions. Thus

$$D_R(t, \Omega, \mathbf{q}) = \bar{D}_R(\Omega, \mathbf{q}) = \frac{1}{\Omega^2 - c^2 q^2 + m^2 + ic_d \Omega}, \quad B(t, \Omega) = B(\Omega) = - \int \frac{c^2 q dq}{2\pi} \text{Im} \bar{D}_R(\Omega, \mathbf{q}) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \text{arctg} \left(\frac{c_d \Omega}{m^2} \right). \quad (53)$$

Analogous but complex conjugated expression one can obtain for $\bar{\Pi}_A(\Omega)$. By applying Wigner transform to the expressions for fermionic self-energies Σ_R , Σ_A , and Σ_K given by Eqs. (27) - (31) and substituting expressions for f and f_B from Eq. (44) we obtain

$$\text{Im} \Sigma_R(x, \omega) = -\frac{\Gamma}{2} - \frac{g'^2 k_F}{v_F} \int \frac{d\Omega}{2\pi} \int \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} B(\Omega) [f_B(x, \Omega, \theta) - f(x, \omega - \Omega, \theta) + 1] \quad (54)$$

$$\text{Re} \Sigma_R(x, \omega) = \frac{g'^2 k_F}{2v_F} \int \frac{d\Omega}{2\pi} \int \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} B'(\Omega) (2f(x, \omega - \Omega, \theta) - 1), \quad (55)$$

$$\Sigma_K(x, \omega) = 4i\Gamma \int \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} f(x, \omega, \theta) - 2i\Gamma + i \frac{g'^2 k_F}{v_F} \int \frac{d\Omega}{2\pi} \int \frac{d\theta d\theta'}{(2\pi)^2} B(\Omega) (2f_B(\Omega, \theta') + 1) (f(\omega + \Omega, \theta) + f(\omega - \Omega, \theta) - 1) \quad (56)$$

where $\Gamma = v^2 k_F / v_F$ and

$$B'(\Omega) = c^2 \int \frac{d^2 q}{(2\pi)^2} \text{Re} D_R(\Omega, \mathbf{q}) = \frac{1}{8\pi} \ln \left(\frac{c^4 \Lambda_q^4}{m^4 + c_d^2 \Omega^2} \right) \quad (57)$$

with Λ_q being a UV cutoff such that $c\Lambda_q \sim T_F$. The expression for Σ_{21} is

$$\Sigma_{21, g'} = i \frac{g'^2 c^2}{4} \int \frac{d^2 k}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{d^2 k'}{(2\pi)^2} \int \frac{d\Omega}{2\pi} [D_R(x, \Omega, \mathbf{q}) G_A(x, \omega - \Omega, \mathbf{k}) + D_A(x, \Omega, \mathbf{q}) G_A(x, \omega + \Omega, \mathbf{k}) + D_A(x, \Omega, \mathbf{q}) G_R(x, \omega - \Omega, \mathbf{k}) + D_R(x, \Omega, \mathbf{q}) G_R(x, \omega + \Omega, \mathbf{k})] = 0 \quad (58)$$

due to all the poles for contour integration over Ω being on one side of the contour for every term in the integral. Therefore, the causality structure of the fermionic Green's functions is also self-consistent, and our Keldysh expansion is performed correctly.

Now we proceed to deriving the closed form of the kinetic equations for f and f_B with the use of all the self-energies expressed as functionals of f and f_B . To perform the derivation, we need to transform the Dyson equations for G_K and D_K , which according to Eqs. (13) and (14) are

$$G_K = G_R \circ \Sigma_K \circ G_A, \quad D_K = D_R \circ \Pi_K \circ D_A, \quad (59)$$

can be converted into the corresponding Dyson equations for $G^<$ and $D^<$:

$$G^< = \frac{1}{2}G_R \circ \Sigma_K \circ G_A - \frac{1}{2}G_R + \frac{1}{2}G_A, \quad D^< = \frac{1}{2}D_R \circ \Pi_K \circ D_A - \frac{1}{2}D_R + \frac{1}{2}D_A. \quad (60)$$

As the next step towards kinetic equations we compute the commutator of inverse bare Green's functions with the lesser Green's functions, in a similar to Kamenev manner in [4] with the use of Eq. (60):

$$[G_0^{-1}; G^<] = \Sigma_R \circ G^< - G^< \circ \Sigma_A + \frac{1}{2}(\Sigma_K + \Sigma_A - \Sigma_R) \circ G_A - \frac{1}{2}G_R \circ (\Sigma_K + \Sigma_A - \Sigma_R) \quad (61)$$

$$[D_0^{-1}; D^<] = \Pi_R \circ D^< - D^< \circ \Pi_A + \frac{1}{2}(\Pi_K + \Pi_A - \Pi_R) \circ D_A - \frac{1}{2}D_R \circ (\Pi_K + \Pi_A - \Pi_R) \quad (62)$$

Eqs. (61) and (62) are the kinetic equations for the lesser functions in the real space. To show that they are, in fact, closed equations for f and f_B , we perform a Wigner transform on Eqs. (61) and (62) and integrate them over corresponding absolute values of momenta. The independence of self-energies on momenta will allow to close the equations on momenta-independent f and f_B . Before obtaining full, non-equilibrium, expressions, it is useful to first understand the relations between the equilibrium solutions to these equations. In thermal equilibrium Eqs. (61) and (62) reduce to

$$(2\bar{f}(\omega) - 1) \text{Im} \bar{\Sigma}_R(\omega) - \frac{i}{2}\bar{\Sigma}_K(\omega) = 0, \quad (63)$$

$$\left(\bar{f}_B(\Omega) + \frac{1}{2}\right) \text{Im} \bar{\Pi}_R(\Omega) + \frac{i}{4}\bar{\Pi}_K(\Omega) = 0. \quad (64)$$

These equations can be trivially satisfied by a solution of the form

$$\bar{f}(\omega) = \frac{1}{e^{\beta\omega} + 1}, \quad \bar{f}_B(\Omega) = \frac{1}{e^{\beta\Omega} - 1}, \quad \beta = \frac{1}{T}. \quad (65)$$

Therefore, our initial guess about the structure of the thermal equilibrium ground state is correct. After a Wigner transform and integration over the absolute value of momenta, with the use of relations in Eqs. (63) we obtain the equations for fermion and boson distributions. Kinetic equation for fermions can be the most conveniently written as

$$A[f, \partial_t f] + e(\mathbf{v}_F \cdot \mathbf{E}) \partial_\omega f = -\Gamma(f - f_0) - \bar{g}(\omega, T)(f - \bar{f}) + I_{g'}[f_B, f] - (f - 1/2)\delta g[f_B, f], \quad (66)$$

where $f_0 = \int \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} f$, kinetic term $A[f, \partial_t f]$ can be written as

$$A[f, \partial_t f] = (1 - \partial_\omega \text{Re} \Sigma_R) \partial_t f + \partial_\omega f \partial_t \text{Re} \Sigma_R \quad (67)$$

with $\text{Re} \Sigma_R$ given by Eq. (55), collision integral term $g(\omega, T) = -\text{Im} \Sigma_{R, g'}$, and terms $I_{g'}$ and $I_{\delta g}$ are

$$I_{g'}[f_B, f] = \frac{g'^2 k_F}{2v_F} \int \frac{d\Omega}{2\pi} \int \frac{d\theta d\theta'}{(2\pi)^2} (K_{g'}[f_B, f] - K_{g'}[\bar{f}_B, \bar{f}]) \quad (68)$$

$$\delta g[f_B, f] = \frac{2g'^2 k_F}{v_F} \int \frac{d\Omega}{2\pi} \int \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} (K_{\delta g}[f_B, f] - K_{\delta g}[\bar{f}_B, \bar{f}]) \quad (69)$$

with

$$K_{g'}[f_B, f] = B(\Omega)(2f_B(\Omega, \theta) + 1)(f(\omega + \Omega, \theta') + f(\omega - \Omega, \theta') - 1) \quad (70)$$

$$K_{\delta g}[f_B, f] = B(\Omega)(f_B(\Omega, \theta) - f(\omega - \Omega, \theta)) \quad (71)$$

Kinetic equation for boson can be written as

$$\partial_t f_B + c_d(f_B - \bar{f}_B) = I_B[f] + C(\Omega) \partial_t I_B[f], \quad (72)$$

where we introduced following notation:

$$I_B[f] = -\frac{c_d}{4\Omega} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\omega \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \frac{d\theta'}{2\pi} (K_B[f] - K_B[\bar{f}]), \quad K_B[f] = (1 - 2f(x, \omega + \Omega, \theta))(1 - 2f(x, \omega, \theta')), \quad (73)$$

and $C(\Omega) = \partial_\Omega B'(\Omega)/2B(\Omega)$. Expression for $c_d = g'^2 k_F^2 c^2 / 4\pi v_F^2$ coincides with the corresponding thermal field theory expression.

Kinetic equations in Eqs. (66) and (72) have a very complicated form, however, as we will see below, some of the terms will always remain small and thus can be neglected leading to a more tractable model. First of all, we would like to note that equations above use the "small external frequency assumption" used in Eq. (??), which requires inequalities

$$|\partial_\omega \text{Re} \bar{\Sigma}_R \partial_t \delta f| \ll |\text{Im} \bar{\Sigma}_R f| \quad (74)$$

$$|\partial_\omega \bar{f} \partial_t \text{Re} \delta \Sigma_R| \ll |(2\bar{f} - 1) \text{Im} \bar{\Sigma}_R| \quad (75)$$

$$|C(\Omega) \partial_t \Pi_K| \ll |\Pi_K| \quad (76)$$

to hold. All three of these inequalities can be eventually simplified to $\nu \leq T$, where ν is a characteristic frequency of external perturbation and T is the temperature of the system. Additionally, we require $T \leq c_d$ to hold, so Landau damping term $c_D \Omega \gg \Omega^2$ in the structure of D_R . These inequalities naturally create a hierarchy of energy scales

$$\nu \lesssim T \sim \omega \sim \Omega \ll c_d \lesssim T_F \quad (77)$$

that allows us to simplify the kinetic equations. We start our analysis from the boson kinetic equation. We notice that all the terms in Eq. (72) are of the order of $c_d f_B$, while the $\partial_t f_B$ term is of the order of νf_B . The term proportional to $C(\Omega)$ can be neglected for a similar reason as one proportional to $c_d \nu / T f_B$. Thus the time derivative term in Eq. (72) can be neglected. We will introduce one more modification, which this time is phenomenological. In a more realistic system one can imagine other types of disorder and interaction that might lead to an additional Landau damping on top of the self-consistent damping that comes from the Fermion interaction. Thus the damping term $c'_d (f_B - \bar{f}_B)$ can have a constant $c'_d \geq c_d$. Thus, one of the ways to phenomenologically include extra damping is to modify the constant c_d in the Landau damping term. We define a coefficient $\lambda = c_d / c'_d$ and we can write down a resulting boson kinetic equation as

$$f_B(t, \Omega) = \bar{f}_B(\Omega) + \lambda I_B[f](t, \Omega). \quad (78)$$

Thus, when no additional Landau damping is present ($\lambda = 1$), the non-equilibrium distribution of a fermion drives the distribution of a boson out of equilibrium. When the additional Landau damping dominates over self-consistent part c_d ($\lambda = 0$), the boson will always remain in a thermal distribution. Thus case of $\lambda = 0$ corresponds to a scenario considered in [6], while $\lambda \neq 0$ is new to this model and interpolates between the thermalized boson and a fully self-consistent boson dynamics.

We begin simplifying the fermion kinetic equation from considering the structure of equilibrium fermionic self-energies as a function of T , ω , and m . We consider a small T expression for the fermion self-energy derived in [3, 6] and given by

$$\bar{\Sigma}_R = -i\Gamma + i \frac{g'^2 k_F}{8\pi v_F} T \left[\ln \left(\frac{c^2 \Lambda_q^2}{m^2} \right) - 2 \left(\ln \Gamma \left(\frac{c^2 \Lambda_q^2}{2\pi c_d T} + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{i\omega}{2\pi T} \right) - \ln \Gamma \left(\frac{m^2}{2\pi c_d T} + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{i\omega}{2\pi T} \right) - \ln \Gamma \left(\frac{c^2 \Lambda_q^2}{2\pi c_d T} \right) + \ln \Gamma \left(\frac{m^2}{2\pi c_d T} \right) \right], \quad (79)$$

where $\Gamma(z)$ is an Euler gamma-function and Λ_q – a UV cutoff of the boson. Assuming that scale of the UV cutoff Λ_q is dominant over all the other scales, the expression for the self-energy can be further simplified based on the structure of $m(T)$. The structure of boson thermal mass at the critical value, according to [3], in the leading order is

$$m^2(T) \approx \frac{\pi c_d T}{\ln \left(\frac{\Lambda_q^2 c^2}{c_d T} \right)} \quad (80)$$

With this expression for thermal mass, relevant for the equation quantities become (expanding for $c\Lambda_q \gg m, c_d, T$):

$$a(\omega, T) = 1 - \partial_\omega \text{Re} \bar{\Sigma}_R = 1 + \frac{g'^2 k_F}{8\pi^2 v_F} \left[\ln \left(\frac{c^2 \Lambda_q^2}{2\pi c_d T} \right) - \text{Re} \psi^{(0)} \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{m^2}{2\pi c_d T} - \frac{i\omega}{2\pi T} \right) \right] \quad (81)$$

$$\bar{g}(\omega, T) = -2 \text{Im} [\bar{\Sigma}_R + i\Gamma] = \frac{g'^2 k_F}{4\pi v_F} T \left[-\ln \left(\frac{2\pi c_d T}{m^2} \right) + 2 \ln \Gamma \left(\frac{m^2}{2\pi c_d T} \right) - 2 \text{Re} \ln \Gamma \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{m^2}{2\pi c_d T} - \frac{i\omega}{2\pi T} \right) \right] \quad (82)$$

For $T \ll T_F$, $m^2 \ll c_d T$ and the expressions above in the leading order (assuming ω to be of the order or smaller than T) become

$$a_{\text{cr}}(\omega, T) \approx 1 + \frac{g'^2 k_F}{8\pi^2 v_F} \left[\ln \left(\frac{c^2 \Lambda_q^2}{2\pi c_d T} \right) \right] \quad (83)$$

$$g_{\text{cr}}(\omega, T) \approx \frac{g'^2 k_F}{4\pi v_F} T \ln \left(\frac{2c_d T}{m^2} \text{ch} \left(\frac{\omega}{2T} \right) \right) \quad (84)$$

The structure of the self-energy $\bar{\Sigma}_R$ sufficiently away from the critical doping, is still guided by Eq. (79), but now involves

$$m^2(T) \approx \Delta^2 = \text{const}, \quad (85)$$

which gives the boson a temperature-independent gap Δ in the leading order. Assuming we are in the low temperature regime and $\Delta \gg T$, the expressions for $a(\omega, T)$ and $g(\omega, T)$ simplify to the form one would expect from a Fermi liquid:

$$a_{\text{FL}}(\omega, T) = 1 + \frac{g'^2 k_F}{8\pi^2 v_F} \ln \left(\frac{c^2 \Lambda_q^2}{e \Delta^2} \right), \quad (86)$$

$$g_{\text{FL}}(\omega, T) = \frac{g'^2 k_F c_d}{8\pi^2 v_F \Delta^2} (\pi^2 T^2 + \omega^2). \quad (87)$$

The expressions above allow us to better understand the structure of the kinetic and collision integral terms in Eq. (66) close and away from the critical point. From the expression in Eq. (67) we can see that in the critical case the second term, proportional to $\partial_t \Sigma_R$, is suppressed by $\nu/T \ln(T_F/T)$ in comparison to the first term. Away from the critical point, the second term is suppressed by $\nu T/\Delta^2$. Thus in both cases the second term can be neglected. Moreover, the non-equilibrium correction to $\partial_\omega \text{Re} \Sigma_R$ can also be neglected in the first term in Eq. (67), because in the perturbation theory it will always produce terms suppressed by similar to the aforementioned second term factors. Therefore, the complicated dynamic term can be reduced to

$$A[f, \partial_t f] = a(\omega, T) \partial_t f(t, \omega, \theta), \quad (88)$$

where $a(\omega, T)$ takes a form a_{cr} close to the QCP, or a_{FL} away from the QCP with

$$a_{\text{cr}}(\omega, T) = 1 + \frac{g'^2 k_F}{8\pi^2 v_F} \ln \left(\frac{c^2 \Lambda_q^2}{2\pi c_d T} \right), \quad (89)$$

$$a_{\text{FL}}(\omega, T) = 1 + \frac{g'^2 k_F}{8\pi^2 v_F} \ln \left(\frac{c^2 \Lambda_q^2}{e \Delta^2} \right). \quad (90)$$

To summarize the structure of the theory, it is convenient to write it in terms of the angular harmonics $e^{i\theta m}$

$$f_m(t, \omega) = \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} e^{-i\theta m} f(t, \omega, \theta), \quad f_{Bm}(t, \omega) = \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} e^{-i\theta m} f_B(t, \Omega, \theta). \quad (91)$$

The equations for f_m with $m \neq 0$ can be written in a relatively simple form

$$(a(\omega, T) \partial_t + g(t, \omega, T) + \Gamma_m) f_m = -\frac{e v_F}{2} \partial_\omega (\mathcal{E}^* f_{m-1} + \mathcal{E} f_{m+1}), \quad (92)$$

where $\mathcal{E} = E_x + iE_y$. In our model all $\Gamma_m = \Gamma$ for $m \neq 0$, but we would consider a more generic model with different eigenvalues for different harmonics. Since disorder is elastic, we naturally get $\Gamma_0 = 0$ exactly. The equation for an $m = 0$ harmonic of f_m is more complicated:

$$a(\omega, T) \partial_t f_0 + \bar{g}(\omega, T)(f_0 - \bar{f}) + (f_0 - 1/2) \delta g(t, \omega, T) - I_{g'}[f_0, f_{B0}] = -\frac{e v_F}{2} \partial_\omega (\mathcal{E}^* f_{-1} + \mathcal{E} f_{+1}) \quad (93)$$

The $a(\omega, T)$ and $g(t, \omega, T)$ for the form close to the critical point take a form $a_{\text{cr}}(t, \omega, T)$ $g_{\text{cr}}(t, \omega, T)$, and $a_{\text{FL}}(t, \omega, T)$ and $g_{\text{FL}}(t, \omega, T)$ away from the critical point. The expressions for $a_{\text{cr}}(\omega, T)$ and $a_{\text{FL}}(\omega, T)$ are given by Eqs. (89) and (90) correspondingly. Expressions for $g_{\text{cr}}(t, \omega, T)$ and $g_{\text{FL}}(r, \omega, T)$ can be written as

$$g_{\text{cr}}(t, \omega, T) = \bar{g}_{\text{cr}}(\omega, T) + \delta g[f_0, f_{B0}], \quad g_{\text{FL}}(t, \omega, T) = \bar{g}_{\text{FL}}(\omega, T) + \delta g[f_0, f_{B0}]. \quad (94)$$

Expressions for $\bar{g}_{\text{cr}}(\omega, T)$ and $\bar{g}_{\text{FL}}(\omega, T)$ are given by Eqs. (84) and (87), while $I_{g'}$ and δg is given by Eqs. (68) and (69) with an appropriate choice of mass m^2 .

As a last note, we would like to point out a few features of the behavior of f_0 collision integral. For fully consistent boson dynamics with $\lambda = 1$, the linearized collision integrals for density harmonics f_0 and f_{B0} have a natural 0-eigenvalue mode

$$\delta f_0 \sim \frac{\partial}{\partial T} \bar{f}(\omega), \quad \delta f_{B0} \sim \frac{\partial}{\partial T} \bar{f}_B(\Omega), \quad (95)$$

since thermal distributions naturally satisfy kinetic equations of this model. These modes are associated with the energy conservation. Probably a more peculiar feature belongs to a $\lambda = 0$ model, where the boson is thermalized. Since the temperature of the thermal bath is fixed by the strong boson thermalization and the bath strongly interacts with the fermions, the energy is no longer conserved. The smallest eigenvalue of the fermionic collision integral now will correspond to

$$\delta f_0 \sim \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \omega^2} f(\omega), \quad \Gamma_0 = -\frac{g'^2 k_F}{4\pi v_F} \quad (96)$$

with eigenvalue Γ_0 , which can be checked by linearizing $f_0 = \bar{f} + \delta f_0$ in δf the expression in (66). Linearized part of the collision integral from Eq. (93) is produced by \bar{g} , δg , and $I_{g'}$ terms and reads

$$I_{\text{lin}}[\delta f_0](\omega) = -\frac{g'^2 k_F}{v_F} \int \frac{d\Omega}{2\pi} B(\Omega) \left[\left(\text{cth} \left(\frac{\Omega}{2T} \right) + \text{th} \left(\frac{\omega - \Omega}{2T} \right) \right) \delta f_0(\omega) + \text{th} \left(\frac{\omega}{2T} \right) \delta f_0(\omega - \Omega) - \text{cth} \left(\frac{\Omega}{2T} \right) \delta f_0(\omega - \Omega) \right] \quad (97)$$

When $\delta f_0(\omega) = \partial_\omega^2 \bar{f}(\omega)$ is substituted in the equation above it simplifies to

$$I_{\text{lin}}[\partial_\omega^2 \bar{f}](\omega) = -\frac{g'^2 k_F}{v_F} \partial_\omega^2 \bar{f} \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{d\Omega}{2\pi} B(\Omega) \text{cth} \left(\frac{\omega}{2T} \right) \left[\text{th}^2 \left(\frac{\omega + \Omega}{2T} \right) - \text{th}^2 \left(\frac{\omega - \Omega}{2T} \right) \right] \approx -\frac{g'^2 k_F}{4\pi v_F} \partial_\omega^2 \bar{f}(\omega). \quad (98)$$

Where the last approximate equality only holds when $m^2 \ll c_d T$ that holds at sufficiently low temperatures at the critical point. In this work we will not consider the case of thermalized boson away from the quantum critical point and will restrict ourselves to only a fully dynamic case.

III. PERTURBATIVE SOLUTION

A. Distribution function

We construct the perturbation theory in electric field \mathbf{E} to obtain the higher orders of conductivity. We denote the order of perturbation in \mathbf{E} with a superscript:

$$f_m = \sum_i f_m^{(i)}, \quad (99)$$

where $f_m^{(i)}$ is a contribution of i 'th order of perturbation theory. We start from the linear perturbation. It involves only harmonics with $m = \pm 1$, which can be extracted from a linearized in E version of Eq. (92) and can be conveniently written with the help of

$$W_m(\nu, \omega, T) = \frac{k_F v_F}{i\nu a(T) + \Gamma_m + \bar{g}(\omega, T)} \quad (100)$$

for $m \neq 0$ assuming the incoming electric field takes a form

$$\mathcal{E} = \sum_i \mathcal{E}_{\nu_i} e^{i\nu_i t} \quad \mathcal{E}_{\nu_i} = E_{\nu_i x} + iE_{\nu_i y}. \quad (101)$$

The expressions for $f_{\pm 1}^{(1)}$ become

$$f_{-1}^{(1)} = (f_{+1}^{(1)})^* = -\frac{e}{2k_F} \sum_i W_1(\nu_i, \omega, T) \mathcal{E}_{\nu_i} \partial_\omega \bar{f}(\omega). \quad (102)$$

The second order perturbation involves quadrupolar harmonics $m = \pm 2$ and a density harmonic $m = 0$. The quadrupolar harmonics at the level of second order perturbation theory are still described by the linearized version of Eq. (92) and thus can be easily written as

$$f_{-2}^{(2)} = (f_{+2}^{(2)})^* = \frac{e^2}{4k_F^2} \sum_{i,j} W_2(\nu_{ij}, \omega, R) W_1(\nu_i, \omega, T) \mathcal{E}_{\nu_j} \mathcal{E}_{\nu_i} \partial_\omega^2 \bar{f}(\omega), \quad (103)$$

where $\nu_{ij} = \nu_i + \nu_j$. The density harmonic is more complicated due to complicated structure of the collision integral in Eq. (93). In general, it has to be solved separately for every value of λ in Eq. (78), but we are going to focus on the case of a fully thermalized boson $\lambda = 0$ and a fully dynamic boson $\lambda = 1$. Since the structure and behavior of the collision integral is very different in the limiting cases. First consider the case of thermalized boson $\lambda = 0$, it appears that the source term in linearized Eq. (78) is proportional to $\partial_\omega^2 \bar{f}(\omega)$, which is, luckily, an approximate eigenvector of the collision operator. Thus the response for thermalized boson can be conveniently written with a help of

$$W_0(\nu, T) = \frac{k_F v_F}{i\nu a(T) + g_0(T, \lambda)}, \quad g_0(T, \lambda = 0) = \frac{g'^2 k_F}{4\pi v_F} T \sim g(\omega \sim T, T). \quad (104)$$

The expression for $f_0^{(2)}$ becomes

$$f_{0, \lambda=0}^{(2)} = \frac{e^2}{4k_F^2} \sum_{i,j} W_0(\nu_{ij}, \omega, T) \left[\mathcal{E}_{-\nu_j}^* \mathcal{E}_{\nu_i} + \mathcal{E}_{\nu_j} \mathcal{E}_{-\nu_i}^* \right] \frac{\partial}{\partial \omega} \left[W_1(\nu_i, \omega, T) \frac{\partial \bar{f}(\omega)}{\partial \omega} \right] \quad (105)$$

The structure of the response for a dynamic boson ($\lambda = 1$) is principally different. With a dynamic boson the model has a 0-eigenvalue mode as in Eq. (95), which corresponds to the energy conservation. In a more realistic system, there is always some finite but usually small relaxation rate that comes from the energy being drained from electrons into phonons. Moreover, since the eigenvalue of the mode is especially small, the inverse of the collision operator becomes proportional to projector on the 0-eigenmode. Since the projector reduces the response to $\partial_T \bar{f}$, the proportionality coefficient can be interpreted as the variation of temperature ΔT due to the presence of the drive. Thus, the second order correction can be written as

$$f_{0, \lambda=1}^{(2)} \approx \Delta T(t) \frac{\partial \bar{f}}{\partial T}, \quad (106)$$

where the expression for ΔT is model dependent. For a critical regime numeric inversion of the collision integral suggests a form

$$\Delta T \approx A \frac{k_F^2 v_F^2}{T E_0^2} \sum_{i,j} W_0(\nu_{ij}, T) \tilde{W}'_1(\nu_i, T) \left[\mathcal{E}_{-\nu_j}^* \mathcal{E}_{\nu_i} + \mathcal{E}_{\nu_j} \mathcal{E}_{-\nu_i}^* \right], \quad (107)$$

where $E_0 = 2k_F^2 v_F / e$. Expression for W_0 is the same as in Eq. (104) but $g_0(T, \lambda = 1) \ll g(\omega \sim T, T)$ and in the critical regime

$$A_{\text{cr}} = \frac{3}{4\sqrt{2\pi^2 - 12}}, \quad \tilde{W}'_{k, \text{cr}}(\nu, T) = \frac{k_F v_F}{i\nu a_{\text{cr}} + \Gamma_k + \tilde{g}'_{\text{cr}}(T)}, \quad \tilde{g}'_{\text{cr}}(T) = \frac{g'^2 k_F}{4\pi v_F} T \left(\frac{5}{6} + \ln \left(\frac{c_d T}{m^2} \right) \right). \quad (108)$$

Away from the equilibrium, where the Fermi liquid regime takes place, we obtain

$$A_{\text{FL}} = \frac{1}{2\pi}, \quad \tilde{W}'_{1, \text{FL}}(\nu, T) = \frac{k_F v_F}{i\nu a_{\text{FL}} + \Gamma_1 + \tilde{g}'_{\text{FL}}(T)}, \quad \tilde{g}'_{\text{FL}}(T) = \frac{g'^2 k_F c_d}{8\pi^2 v_F \Delta^2} \frac{14\pi^2 T^2}{5}. \quad (109)$$

Expression for A_{cr} , A_{FL} , \tilde{g}'_{cr} , and \tilde{g}'_{FL} is obtained from a numerical inversion of the corresponding linearized collision operators. Even though exact expression might be useful for measuring the relaxation rates, as we will see below, the overall response driven by the effective temperature change can be completely understood through ΔT only.

The third order perturbation involves the responses attributed to the excitation of the quadrupolar $f_{\pm 2}$ and a density f_0 harmonics. We distinguish those by the rates that those involve: the quadrupolar-induced responses would always involve W_2 , while the density-induced responses will always involve W_0 . We construct and treat those responses separately. First we focus on the third order response arising from the quadrupolar excitation of the second order.

The third order perturbation of $f_{\pm 1}^{(3)}$ that is associated with a perturbation of a quadrupolar harmonic $f_{\pm 2}^{(2)}$ can be written as

$$f_{-1,\text{quad}}^{(3)} = (f_{+1,\text{quad}}^{(3)})^* = -\frac{e^3}{8k_F^3} \sum_{i,j,l} \mathcal{E}_{\nu_i} \mathcal{E}_{\nu_j} \mathcal{E}_{-\nu_l}^* W_1(\nu_{ijl}, \omega, T) \frac{\partial}{\partial \omega} \left[W_2(\nu_{ij}, \omega, T) \frac{\partial}{\partial \omega} \left[W_1(\nu_i, \omega, T) \frac{\partial \bar{f}}{\partial \omega} \right] \right] \quad (110)$$

and is the only term of that type.

The contributions from the perturbations of the density harmonics at the 2nd order of perturbation theory takes a more complicated form. The third order approximation is the leading order at which non-linear corrections appear, in particular, correction to the scattering rate $\delta g[f_0, f_{B0}]$. However, as a non-linear correction, it only plays a role of an extra source term and thus can be easily included in the dynamics. As δg correction comes from the density harmonic distortion $f_0^{(2)}$, and thus it has to be attributed to all the other responses originating from $f_0^{(2)}$. As an additional complication, the details of the third order perturbation become dependent on the value of λ , since the structure $\delta f_0^{(2)}$ depends on λ . One $f_0^{(2)}$ -driven contribution into $f_{\pm 1}^{(3)}$ comes from the right hand side term in Eq. (92), which we denote as $f_{\pm 1,\text{lin}}^{(3)}$. Another contribution that appears at the 3rd order is coming from the perturbation δg , we denote it as $f_{\pm 1,\delta g}^{(3)}$. The corresponding expressions take a form

$$f_{-1,\text{lin}}^{(3)} = (f_{+1,\text{lin}}^{(3)})^* = -\frac{e}{2k_F} \sum_i W_1(\nu_{ijl}, \omega, T) \mathcal{E}_{\nu_i} \partial_\omega f_0^{(2)}(\omega), \quad (111)$$

$$f_{+1,\delta g}^{(3)} = (f_{-1,\delta g}^{(3)})^* = -\frac{1}{k_F v_F} \sum_{ijl} W_1(\nu_{ijl}, \omega, T) \delta g[f_0^{(2)}] f_1^{(1)}. \quad (112)$$

where the expressions for $f_0^{(2)}$ and δg are λ -dependent. The expressions for $f_0^{(2)}$ for both $\lambda = 0$ and $\lambda = 1$ have already been shown in Eqs. (105) and (106). Expressions for δg differ in the case of $\lambda = 0$ and $\lambda = 1$, because in the $\lambda = 0$ case the bosonic dynamics is absent and $f_{B0}^{(2)} = 0$. The corresponding expressions are

$$\delta g_{\lambda=0} = -\frac{2g'^2 k_F}{v_F} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{d\Omega}{2\pi} B(\Omega) f_{0,\lambda=0}^{(2)}(\omega - \Omega) \quad (113)$$

$$\delta g_{\lambda=1} = -\frac{2g'^2 k_F}{v_F} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{d\Omega}{2\pi} B(\Omega) \left[f_{0,\lambda=1}^{(2)}(\omega - \Omega) - \frac{1}{\Omega} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\omega (1 - \bar{f}(\omega + \Omega) - \bar{f}(\omega - \Omega)) f_{0,\lambda=1}^{(2)}(\omega) \right] \quad (114)$$

In case of $\lambda = 1$ a general solution can be constructed in a simple manner due to $f_0^{(2)} \sim \partial_T \bar{f}$. This property simplifies the expression for δg in a general form to be $\delta g = \Delta T \partial_T \bar{g}(\omega, T)$. The total response then can be expressed as

$$f_{-1,J}^{(3)} = f_{+1,\text{lin}}^{(3)} + f_{+1,\delta g}^{(3)} = \sum_{ijl} \Delta T(t) \frac{\partial}{\partial T} \left[\left(-\frac{e}{2k_F} \right) W_1(\nu_{ijl}, \omega, T) \mathcal{E}_l \partial_\omega \bar{f}(\omega) \right] \quad (115)$$

The expression for $\lambda = 0$ density response can be written as

$$f_{-1,J}^{(3)} = -\frac{g'^2 k_F}{4\pi v_F} \left(\frac{e}{2k_F} \right)^3 \sum_{ijl} \mathcal{E}_l (\mathcal{E}_{-j}^* \mathcal{E}_i + \mathcal{E}_j \mathcal{E}_{-i}^*) \left[W_0(\nu_{ij}, T) W_1(\nu_i, \omega, T) W_1(\nu_l, \omega, T) W_1(\nu_{ijl}, \omega, T) \left(\frac{\partial \bar{f}}{\partial \omega} \right)^2 + \right. \\ \left. + W_1(\nu_{ijl}, \omega, T) W_0(\nu_{ij}, T) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \omega^2} \left(W_1(\nu_i, \omega, T) \frac{\partial \bar{f}(\omega)}{\partial \omega} \right) \right] \quad (116)$$

B. Current and conductivity

Using the expressions for the perturbations $f^{(1)}$, $f^{(2)}$, and $f^{(3)}$ to compute linear conductivity and corrections to it using expression in Eq. (43) for current. Corresponding linear response $\sigma(\nu, T)$ is obtained by substituting Eq. (102) into Eq. (39) and can be written as

$$\sigma(\nu, T) = \frac{e^2}{4\pi \hbar} \tilde{W}_1(\nu, T), \quad (117)$$

where we introduce a convenient for the theory notation

$$\tilde{W}_k(\nu, T) = - \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\omega W_k(\nu, \omega, T) \partial_\omega \bar{f}. \quad (118)$$

For finite Γ_k and low enough temperature T and external frequency ν we can evaluate the integral by expanding W_k as a series in $\bar{g}(\omega, T)$ around $\nu = 0$ and $T = 0$ to obtain

$$\tilde{W}_k(\nu, T) \approx \frac{k_F v_F}{i\nu a(T) + \Gamma_k + \tilde{g}(T)}, \quad \tilde{g}(T) = - \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\omega g(\omega, T) \partial_\omega \bar{f}. \quad (119)$$

where corresponding critical and non-critical expressions take a form

$$\tilde{g}_{\text{cr}}(T) = \alpha_1 T \tilde{\gamma}(T), \quad \alpha_1 = \frac{g'^2 k_F}{4\pi v_F}, \quad \tilde{\gamma}(T) = \ln \left(\frac{e}{\pi} \ln \left(\frac{\Lambda_q^2 c^2}{c_d T} \right) \right). \quad (120)$$

$$\tilde{g}_{\text{FL}}(T) = \alpha_2 T^2, \quad \alpha_2 = \frac{4\pi^2}{3} \frac{g'^2 k_F c_d}{8\pi^2 v_F \Delta^2}, \quad (121)$$

$$\beta_{\text{cr}}(T) = 1 + \frac{\alpha_1}{2\pi} \ln \left(\frac{c^2 \Lambda_q^2}{2\pi c_d T} \right), \quad (122)$$

$$\beta_{\text{FL}} = 1 + \frac{\alpha_1}{2\pi} \ln \left(\frac{c^2 \Lambda_q^2}{e \Delta^2} \right). \quad (123)$$

The values α_1 , α_2 , and a_{FL} are independent of temperature, functions $\tilde{\gamma}(T)$ and $a_{\text{cr}}(T)$ are slowly varying functions of temperature, which can be regarded as roughly constant in a wide range of temperature intervals. Near the critical point we reproduce the conductivity of a strange metal, and away from the criticality we reproduce a Fermi liquid.

The second order response to the current is 0 due to inversion symmetry of the system - there are no excitations to $m = \pm 1$ harmonics in the second in electric field order. The corresponding third order responses lead to a few contributions into the non-linear conductivity. Non-linear contribution into current that arises from the density harmonic excitation in the second order response for $\lambda = 1$ is

$$\mathbf{j}_{\lambda=1}^{(3)} = \Delta T \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial T} \mathbf{E}. \quad (124)$$

This contribution is nothing more than a change of a current due to a change of resistance with temperature. The analogous response for $\lambda = 0$ cannot be expressed in such a simple way and cannot be interpreted as a response from the temperature change, since the perturbation $f_0^{(2)}$ is non-thermal according to Eq. (105). Thus the perturbation coming from a density harmonic is

$$\mathbf{j}_{J,\lambda=0}^{(3)} = - \frac{e^2}{4\pi E_0^2} \left(\frac{\alpha_1 k_F v_F}{6T} \right) \sum_{ijl} \mathbf{E}_i (\mathbf{E}_{-j}^* \cdot \mathbf{E}_i) W_0(\nu_{ij}, T) \tilde{W}'_1(\nu_i, T) \tilde{W}'_1(\nu_l, T) \tilde{W}'_1(\nu_{ijl}, T). \quad (125)$$

The expression above still has a polarization structure similar to a joule heating $\mathbf{E}^2 \mathbf{E}$, but can no longer be interpreted in this way, since $f_0^{(2)}$ does not have a thermal profile. Thus, this response will violate the normal resistance change due to Joule heating with respect to its magnitude, but will still have similar response properties. The non-linear conductivity then can be written as

$$\sigma_{J,\lambda=0}^{(3) a,bcd}(\nu_b, \nu_c, \nu_d; T) = - \frac{e^2}{4\pi E_0^2} \left(\frac{\alpha_1 k_F v_F}{6T} \right) \delta_{ab} \delta_{cd} W_0(\nu_{cd}, T) \tilde{W}'_1(\nu_d, T) \tilde{W}'_1(\nu_b, T) \tilde{W}'_1(\nu_{bcd}, T). \quad (126)$$

The third order non-linear response that arises from the quadrupolar harmonic in the second order response can be written as

$$\mathbf{j}_Q^{(3)} = - \frac{e^2}{4\pi} \left(\frac{k_F v_F}{E_0^2} \right) \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\omega \sum_{ijl} \frac{\partial^2 W_1}{\partial \omega^2}(\nu_{ijl}, \omega, T) W_2(\nu_{ij}, \omega, T) W_1(\nu_i, \omega, T) \frac{\partial \bar{f}}{\partial \omega} \Delta^{abc} E_{\nu_i, a} E_{\nu_j, b} E_{-\nu_l, c} \quad (127)$$

where vector Δ^{abc} is $\Delta^{abc} = (\text{Re } v^a v^b v^{c*}, \text{Im } v^a v^b v^{c*})$, $\mathbf{v} = (1, i)$. Values $E_{\nu, a}$ are x - and y - components of \mathbf{E}_ν .

After simplifying the expression above, in the leading order in temperature close to the critical point we obtain

$$\sigma_{\text{cr},Q}^{(3),a,bcd}(\nu_b, \nu_c, \nu_d; T) = -\frac{e^2}{4\pi E_0^2} \left(\frac{2\alpha_1 k_F v_F}{3T} \right) \delta_{ab} \delta_{cd} \tilde{W}'_1{}^2(\nu_{bcd}, T) \tilde{W}'_2(\nu_{cd}, T) \tilde{W}'_1(\nu_d, T). \quad (128)$$

On the other hand, in the Fermi liquid regime we obtain

$$\sigma_{\text{FL},Q}^{(3),a,bcd}(\nu_b, \nu_c, \nu_d; T) = -\frac{e^2}{4\pi E_0^2} \left(\frac{3\alpha_2}{2\pi^2} \right) \delta_{ab} \delta_{cd} \tilde{W}'_1{}^2(\nu_{bcd}, T) \tilde{W}'_2(\nu_{cd}, T) \tilde{W}'_1(\nu_d, T). \quad (129)$$

One can see from Eq. (127) that quadrupolar responses are susceptible to the second derivative of W over ω , and thus are susceptible to the derivatives of electron self-energies Σ_R . Hence higher order responses are, in general, susceptible to higher order derivatives of self energy. every two extra orders in \mathbf{E} would add two extra derivatives ∂_ω and two extra factors of W_m when non-linear responses are considered. Since $\Sigma_R = \Sigma_R(\omega/T)$ close to the criticality, in the leading order in $1/T$ every derivative of ω will result in the extra factor of $1/T$ contributing to the higher order conductivity. Therefore, the scaling suggests

$$\sigma^{(2n+1)} \sim \frac{E^{2n+1}}{T^{2n-1}} \quad (130)$$

for $n \geq 1$. Thus, non-linear current $\mathbf{j}_{\text{non-lin}}(\mathbf{E}, T)$ has to scale as

$$\mathbf{j}_{\text{non-lin}} \sim T^2 F \left(\frac{\mathbf{E}}{T} \right), \quad (131)$$

where F is a sample-dependent function. In contrast, away from the criticality the dependence of the self-energy goes as $\Sigma_R \sim \omega^2/\Delta^2$, and thus the scaling of the form of Eq. (131) will not take place.

IV. THIRD-ORDER RESPONSE FOR LATTICE SYSTEMS

Here we propose and analyze a heuristic generalization of the kinetic equations above to lattice systems with discrete rotations symmetry. To work out the responses for a D_{4h} symmetric system we expand the responses into irreducible representations of D_{4h} instead of expanding the response in angular harmonics. We assume that scattering rates are fixed for each separate irreducible representation. Thus, instead of using $W_m(\nu, \omega, T)$, where m is a number of an angular momentum, one should use W_α , where $\alpha \in \{A_{1g}, E_u, B_{1g}, B_{2g}\}$ - irreducible representations of D_{4h} . Thus, for example, $W_{E_u} = k_F v_F / (i a_{E_u}(T) + \Gamma_{E_u} + g_{E_u}(\omega, T))$. We will assume a form of $g_\alpha(\omega, T)$ and $a_\alpha(T)$ similar to the spherically symmetric $g(\omega, T)$ and $a(T)$ dependence on T and ω .

By applying considerations analogous to a circularly symmetric case, one can construct the third-order response mediated by quadrupolar excitations of the distribution of B_{1g} and B_{2g} irreducible representations as

$$\mathbf{j}_{Q,B_{1g}/B_{2g}}^{(3)} = -A_{Q,B_{1g}/B_{2g}} \frac{e^2}{4\pi \hbar E_0^2} \sum_{ijl} \Phi_{B_{1g}/B_{2g}}(\mathbf{E}, \nu_l, \nu_j, \nu_i) \tilde{W}'_{E_u}{}^2(\nu_{ijl}) \tilde{W}'_{B_{1g}/B_{2g}}(\nu_{ij}) \tilde{W}'_{E_u}(\nu_i) \quad (132)$$

Where for B_{1g} we have

$$\Phi_{B_{1g}}(\mathbf{E}, \nu_l, \nu_j, \nu_i) = \mathbf{e}_x E_{\nu_l, x} (E_{\nu_j, x} E_{\nu_i, x} - E_{\nu_j, y} E_{\nu_i, y}) + \mathbf{e}_y E_{\nu_l, y} (E_{\nu_j, y} E_{\nu_i, y} - E_{\nu_j, x} E_{\nu_i, x}), \quad (133)$$

and for B_{2g} we have

$$\Phi_{B_{2g}}(\mathbf{E}, \nu_l, \nu_j, \nu_i) = \mathbf{e}_x E_{\nu_l, y} (E_{\nu_j, y} E_{\nu_i, x} + E_{\nu_j, x} E_{\nu_i, y}) + \mathbf{e}_y E_{\nu_l, x} (E_{\nu_j, y} E_{\nu_i, x} + E_{\nu_j, x} E_{\nu_i, y}). \quad (134)$$

Corresponding expressions for $A_{Q,B_{1g}/B_{2g}}$ are

$$A_{Q,B_{1g}} = A_Q \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} (\hat{v}_{F,x}^4(\theta) - \hat{v}_{F,x}^2(\theta) \hat{v}_{F,y}^2(\theta)), \quad A_{Q,B_{2g}} = A_Q \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \hat{v}_{F,x}^2(\theta) \hat{v}_{F,y}^2(\theta). \quad (135)$$

Vector $\hat{v}_F = (\hat{v}_{F,x}, \hat{v}_{F,y})$ is a unit vector in the direction of Fermi velocity. When all \mathbf{E}_{ν_i} are directed either along x or y , only $\mathbf{j}_{Q,B_{1g}}^{(3)}$ is non-zero and $\mathbf{j}_{Q,B_{2g}}^{(3)} = 0$. When all \mathbf{E}_{ν_i} are directed along the diagonal in the xy plane, $\mathbf{j}_{Q,B_{1g}}^{(3)} = 0$ and $\mathbf{j}_{Q,B_{2g}}^{(3)}$ is non-zero.

Since these responses have different magnitude due to $\Gamma_{B_{1g}} \neq \Gamma_{B_{2g}}$, when applied electric field is not directed along x , y , or xy diagonal, the non-linear current arising from quadrupolar responses $\mathbf{j}_{Q,B_{1g}}^{(3)} + \mathbf{j}_{Q,B_{2g}}^{(3)}$ will not be collinear with \mathbf{E} . Moreover, the perpendicular to \mathbf{E} part of the current will consist only from the quadrupolar responses, since the response arising from density A_{1g} representation will always be collinear with \mathbf{E} . Thus, measuring the perpendicular to \mathbf{E} component of a total non-linear current $\mathbf{j}^{(3)}$ allows direct access to the quadrupolar responses.

V. ESTIMATES FOR BI-2212

We chose Bi-2212, since experimental information both about transport and Fermi surface properties of this material is available. First, we estimate the non-linear correction to conductivity from quadrupolar processes, not arising from heat. For this we assume that all the decay rates $\Gamma_{m \neq 0} = \Gamma$ are equal and that $k_F \sim E_F/V_F$. This allows us to estimate the non-linear correction $\sigma_{\pm 2}^{(3)}$ from the value of linear sheet conductivity σ .

Sections 3 and 13 of Supplemental Information to work [7] contain the information about bulk resistivity and single conducting sheet thickness, which allows us to obtain relevant sheet resistivity data. For temperature taken at $T \sim 40$ K: $\rho \sim 40 \mu\Omega \cdot \text{cm}$ (see Section 3 Fig. 3 d of Supplemental information of [7] for $T = 20$ K), $T_F \sim 2 \cdot 10^3 \text{K}$, single sheet thickness $d \sim 0.8 \text{nm}$ (see Section 13, Table S2 of [7]), $v_F \sim 3 \cdot 10^5 \text{m/s}$ [8, 9]. Cited data and assumptions above are sufficient to estimate the orders of magnitude of $\bar{W}_1(\nu = 0, T = 40 \text{K}) \sim 100$ with use of Eq. (117), $E_0 = 2k_F^2 v_F/e \sim 1 \text{MV/cm}$ and $A_Q \sim T_F/T \sim 50$, which results in the value for the non-linear conductivity $\sigma^{(3)} \sim 3 \cdot 10^{-4} A_Q \Omega^{-1} \text{m}^{-1} (\text{V/m})^{-2}$.

For pulsed field experiments, we can also estimate nonlinear response due to heating; for a pulse of $\sim 10 \text{ps}$ [10] and magnitude of $E = 50 \text{V/cm}$, specific heat $c \sim 50 \text{mJ/gK}$ [11], mass density $\rho_m \sim 6.5 \cdot 10^6 \text{g/m}^3$ [12], and $d\rho/dT \sim 0.6 \mu\Omega \text{cm/K}$ (see Section 13, Table S2 of [7]), the temperature raise per pulse will be $\Delta T \sim 2 \text{mK}$, which will result in non-linear correction to conductivity $\sigma_J^{(3)} \sim 3 \cdot 10^{-6} \Omega^{-1} \text{m}^{-1} (\text{V/m})^{-2}$ and relative value $\sigma_J^{(3)}/\sigma^{(1)} = \frac{\Delta\tau}{c\rho_m\rho} \frac{d\rho/dT}{\rho} \approx 10^{-12} (\text{V/m})^{-2}$.

One can also imagine a transport experiment at extremely low temperature. For $T \sim 10 \text{K}$ obtained with the methods similar to [7] and [13] and electric pulse of $\tau \sim 0.1 \mu\text{s}$, one would expect a similar order of magnitude $\sigma_{\pm 2}^{(3)}$ response to the one computed above, and $\sigma_0^{(3)} \sim 1 \cdot 10^{-2} \Omega^{-1} \text{m}^{-1} (\text{V/m})^{-2}$, which for $A_Q \sim 200$ still results in the non-heating related component being slightly stronger.

-
- [1] I. Esterlis, H. Guo, A. A. Patel, and S. Sachdev, *Large- N theory of critical Fermi surfaces*, *Phys. Rev. B* **103**, 235129 (2021), [arXiv:2103.08615 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
 - [2] H. Guo, A. A. Patel, I. Esterlis, and S. Sachdev, *Large- N theory of critical Fermi surfaces. II. Conductivity*, *Phys. Rev. B* **106**, 115151 (2022), [arXiv:2207.08841 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
 - [3] A. A. Patel, H. Guo, I. Esterlis, and S. Sachdev, *Universal theory of strange metals from spatially random interactions*, *Science* **381**, 790 (2023), [arXiv:2203.04990 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
 - [4] A. Kamenev, *Field Theory of Non-Equilibrium Systems* (Cambridge University Press, 2011).
 - [5] C. P. Nave and P. A. Lee, *Transport properties of a spinon Fermi surface coupled to a $U(1)$ gauge field*, *Phys. Rev. B* **76**, 235124 (2007).
 - [6] A. Nikolaenko, S. Sachdev, and A. A. Patel, *Theory of shot noise in strange metals*, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **5**, 043143 (2023).
 - [7] A. Legros, S. Benhabib, W. Tabiś, F. Laliberté, M. Dion, M. Lizaire, B. Vignolle, D. Vignolles, H. Raffy, Z. Li, P. Auban-Senzier, N. Doiron-Leyraud, P. Fournier, D. Colson, L. Taillefer, and C. Proust, *Universal T -linear resistivity and Planckian dissipation in overdoped cuprates*, *Nature Physics* **15** (2019), [arXiv:1805.02512 \[cond-mat.supr-con\]](#).
 - [8] I. M. Vishik, W. S. Lee, F. Schmitt, B. Moritz, T. Sasagawa, S. Uchida, K. Fujita, S. Ishida, C. Zhang, T. P. Devereaux, and Z. X. Shen, *Doping-dependent nodal fermi velocity of the high-temperature superconductor $\text{Bi}_2\text{Sr}_2\text{CaCu}_2\text{O}_{8+\delta}$ revealed using high-resolution angle-resolved photoemission spectroscopy*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 207002 (2010).
 - [9] J. Hwang, *Superconducting coherence length of hole-doped cuprates obtained from electron-boson spectral density function*, *Scientific Reports* **11**, 11668 (2021).
 - [10] D. Barbalas, R. R. III, D. Chaudhuri, F. Mahmood, H. P. Nair, N. J. Schreiber, D. G. Schlom, K. M. Shen, and N. P. Armitage, *Energy relaxation and dynamics in the correlated metal Sr_2RuO_4 via thz two-dimensional coherent spectroscopy* (2023), [arXiv:2312.13502 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
 - [11] C. S. Myers, M. A. Susner, L. Motowidlo, J. Distin, M. D. Sumption, and E. W. Collings, *Specific heats of composite $\text{Bi}2212$, Nb_3Sn , and MgB_2 wire conductors*, *IEEE Transactions on Applied Superconductivity* **23**, 8800204 (2013).
 - [12] Bi-2212 ($\text{Sr}_2\text{CaCu}_2\text{Bi}_2\text{O}_8$) Crystal Structure: Datasheet from “PAULING FILE Multinaries Edition – 2022” in Springer-*Materials*.
 - [13] M. N. Kunchur, *Current-induced pair breaking in magnesium diboride*, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **16**, R1183 (2004).