

Fermi Liquid near a $q=0$ Charge Quantum Critical Point

R. David Mayrhofer and Andrey V. Chubukov

*School of Physics and Astronomy and William I. Fine Theoretical Physics Institute,
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455, USA*

Peter Wölfle

*Institute for Theory of Condensed Matter and
Institute for Quantum Materials and Technologies,
Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, 76131 Karlsruhe, Germany*

(Dated: March 18, 2024)

arXiv:2403.09835v1 [cond-mat.str-el] 14 Mar 2024

Abstract

We analyze the quasiparticle interaction function (the fully dressed and antisymmetrized interaction between fermions) for a two-dimensional Fermi liquid at zero temperature close to a $q=0$ charge quantum critical point (QCP) in the s -wave channel. By the Ward identities, this vertex function must be related to quasiparticle residue Z , which can be obtained independently from the fermionic self-energy. We show that to satisfy these Ward identities, one needs to go beyond the standard diagrammatic formulation of Fermi liquid theory and include series of additional contributions to the vertex function. These contributions are forbidden in a conventional Fermi liquid, but do emerge near a QCP, where the effective 4-fermion interaction is mediated by a soft dynamical boson. We demonstrate explicitly that including these terms restores the Ward identity. We also discuss the role of Aslamazov-Larkin-type diagrams for the vertex function. Our analysis is built on works on the vertex function near an antiferromagnetic QCP [Phys. Rev. B 89, 045108 (2014)] and a d-wave charge-nematic QCP [Phys. Rev. B 81, 045110 (2010)]. We show that for s -wave charge QCP (the one leading to phase separation), the analysis is more straightforward. We also discuss the structure of the Landau function in a critical Fermi liquid near a QCP.

I. INTRODUCTION

Fermi liquids – systems of itinerant interacting fermions, form a class of materials that have been studied very thoroughly both theoretically and experimentally [1–4]. It is well established that the observables in a Fermi liquid have the same functional forms as in a Fermi gas, but differ quantitatively. The theory of a Fermi liquid has been originally developed phenomenologically, based on conservation laws [5], and later re-formulated microscopically, using the diagrammatic analysis and Ward identities [2, 4, 6, 7].

In a microscopic description, the low-energy properties of itinerant fermions are determined by vertex function (the fully dressed anti-symmetrized interaction) at zero momentum and frequency transfer $\Gamma_{\alpha\beta,\gamma\delta}(K, P; K, P) = \Gamma_{\alpha\beta,\gamma\delta}(K, P)$, where we use the abbreviation $K = (\mathbf{k}, \omega_{\mathbf{k}})$ [8]. In a rotationally-invariant system in orbital and spin space, which we consider here, $\Gamma_{\alpha\beta,\gamma\delta}(K, P) = \Gamma_c(K, P)\delta_{\alpha\beta}\delta_{\gamma\delta} + \Gamma_s(K, P)\sigma_{\alpha\beta}\sigma_{\gamma\delta}$. Partial components of Γ_c

and Γ_s taken for fermions on the Fermi surface ($K = K_F, P = P_F$ where $K_F = (\mathbf{k}_F, 0)$) determine the Landau parameters, which determine the renormalizations of thermodynamic properties, coming from fermions in the immediate vicinity of the Fermi surface.

Of particular interest to this work is a different aspect of microscopic Fermi liquid theory: the relations between Γ_s and Γ_c and the quasiparticle Z factor – the residue of the pole in the fermionic Green’s function $G(k, \omega)$ at $k = k_F$. The Z -factor is not determined within Landau Fermi liquid theory as it generally gets renormalized by fermions away from the Fermi surface. However, within microscopic Fermi liquid theory [6, 9] one can explicitly express Z via either spin or charge component of $\Gamma(K_F, P)$ with one of the momenta on the Fermi surface and one away from it. The relations are identical for Γ^c and Γ^s and are [1, 6, 9]

$$\frac{1}{Z} = 1 + 2 \int \Gamma_c(K_F, P) \{G^2(P)\}_\omega \frac{d^3 P}{(2\pi)^3}, \quad (1)$$

$$\frac{1}{Z} = 1 + 2 \int \Gamma_s(K_F, P) \{G^2(P)\}_\omega \frac{d^3 P}{(2\pi)^3}. \quad (2)$$

where G are the full Green’s functions. The quasiparticle residue Z can also be obtained directly, as frequency derivative of the fermionic self-energy $\Sigma(k, \omega)$ at $k = k_F$ and $\omega \rightarrow 0$: $Z^{-1} = 1 + \partial\Sigma(k_F, \omega)/\partial\omega$ (we define self-energy via $G^{-1}(k, \omega) = \omega - \epsilon_k + \Sigma(k, \omega)$). As long as the system is in the Fermi-liquid regime at the lowest frequencies, $\Sigma(k_F, \omega) = \lambda\omega$ and $Z^{-1} = 1 + \lambda$. The dimensionless λ can be directly computed diagrammatically. In this paper we obtain the vertex function $\Gamma_c(K, P)$ which leads to the same Z via Eq. (2).

This issue is most interesting for fermions near a quantum-critical point (QCP), where Fermi liquid behavior holds only at the lowest frequencies, and λ is large. It is customary to describe the low-energy physics near a QCP within the effective model with the interaction $V_{eff}(K, P)$, mediated by soft fluctuations of the order parameter, which condenses on the other side of the QCP. This interaction involves low-energy fermions, hence both K and P can be placed near the Fermi surface. In this work we consider a system near a momentum $q = 0$ QCP in the charge sector – an s -wave charge Pomeranchuk instability, which leads to phase separation [10]. For a $q = 0$ QCP, long-wavelength bosonic fluctuations are relevant. It is then natural to assume that $V_{eff}(K, P) = V_{eff}(Q)$, where $Q = K - P = (\mathbf{q}, \omega_q)$ and that $V_{eff}(Q)$ has an Ornstein-Zernike-type form $V_{eff}(Q) = U(q)/(1 + U(q)\Pi(Q))$, where

$U(q)$ is a bare 4-fermion interaction and $\Pi(Q) > 0$ is the polarization bubble at small momentum and frequency transfer (see e.g., Refs. [11–14]). A charge instability develops at $U < 0$. At a QCP, $U(0)\Pi(0) = -1$. Expanding around $Q = 0$ and assuming $\omega_q \ll v_F q$, one obtains a conventional Landau-overdamped effective interaction. In Matsubara frequencies, $V_{eff}(Q) \propto 1/(\xi^{-2} + (aq)^2 + \gamma|\omega_q|/q)$ where $a = O(1)$ and $\gamma \sim k_F^2/v_F$. The Landau damping term comes from the expansion of $\Pi(Q)$, and the $(aq)^2$ term comes from the expansion of both $U(q)$ and $\Pi(Q)$. The question we address here is whether near the charge QCP the vertex function $\Gamma(K, P)$ is the same as $V_{eff}(K, P)$.

At a first glance, the answer is affirmative because the Ornstein-Zernike form of a bosonic propagator can be explicitly derived by collecting series of renormalizations of the bare $U(q)$ that contain powers of $U(q)\Pi(Q)$. We show below that the vertex function, obtained by antisymmetrizing the interaction and dressing both direct and antisymmetrized components by series of $U(q)\Pi(Q)$, has the form

$$\Gamma_{\alpha\beta,\gamma\delta}^{RPA} = V_{eff}(Q) (\delta_{\alpha\gamma}\delta_{\beta\delta} + \vec{\sigma}_{\alpha\gamma}\vec{\sigma}_{\beta\delta}). \quad (3)$$

We call this vertex function Γ^{RPA} for consistency with notations in previous papers [7, 15, 16] and also because this vertex function is obtained by summing up series of ladder and bubble diagrams made out of free fermions [17]. We see that the spin and charge components of Γ^{RPA} are equal: $\Gamma^{RPA,c} = \Gamma^{RPA,s} = V_{eff}(Q)$. This is consistent with Eq. (2).

At the second glance, there is an issue. The same effective interaction $V_{eff}(Q)$ can be used for the computation of the self-energy. Evaluating it, we obtain near a QCP $\Sigma(k, \omega) \approx \lambda\omega$, where λ is large and scales as ξ . This yields $1/Z \approx \lambda \propto \xi$. Meanwhile, evaluating $1/Z$ from Eq. (2) we obtain $1/Z = O(1)$. The two forms clearly do not match.

We show in this work that the vertex function Γ near a charge QCP differs from Γ^{RPA} in two respects. First, the prefactor a in $V_{eff}(Q)$ gets smaller when we include Fermi-liquid corrections. This agrees with Refs.[15, 18, 19] We keep a as a parameter, so this change does not crucially affect our analysis, although we will argue that this has an interesting consequence for the Fermi-liquid theory near a QCP. Second, we show that Γ differs from Γ^{RPA} by an overall factor proportional to λ . Once we use full Γ in Eq. (2), we recover the equivalence between $1/Z$ obtained from this equation and from the self-energy. We show that

the extra factor in Γ comes from including additional ladder series of diagrams, which contain the polarization bubbles at exactly zero momentum transfer, i.e., the terms $\int d^2q d\omega_q G^2(K+Q)V_{eff}(Q)$ (see Fig. 7 below). In an ordinary Fermi liquid away from a QCP, when Landau damping term in V_{eff} is irrelevant, these terms vanish after frequency integration as the poles in the two Green's functions in the bubble with zero external momentum are in the same frequency half-plane. However, in a “critical” FL near a QCP, the Landau damping term in V_{eff} becomes relevant. Because this term has branch cuts in both frequency half-planes, the frequency integral $\int d\omega_q G^2(K+Q)V_{eff}(Q)$ does not vanish. We show that near a QCP, each element of ladder series is $O(1)$, and their sum dresses Γ^{RPA} by $O(\lambda)$. We obtain the explicit form of Γ , substitute it into Eq. (2) and reproduce Z obtained from the self-energy. We also touch on Aslamazov-Larkin type diagrams for the vertex function and explain why these diagrams are not relevant near a charge QCP.

Our consideration is an extension of earlier works [15, 16, 20], in which the full Γ was obtained in a critical FL for a d -wave nematic order and (π, π) antiferromagnetic order. In these two cases, however, the calculations and resulting expressions are quite involved, particularly for the (π, π) case, where the full Γ was obtained only in certain limits. For the nematic case, the authors of [15, 20] had to use approximate averaging procedures for higher order ladder diagrams, due to multiple d -wave form factors. For the s -wave $q = 0$ charge QCP, which we consider here, we obtain the full analytic form of Γ and show explicitly the equivalence between Fermi liquid and self-energy calculations of the quasiparticle Z factor. We argue that the s -wave $q = 0$ charge QCP serves better to illustrate the essential physics at play than previously studied QCP's.

We also extend the analysis [15] of the Landau function and Landau parameters in a “critical Fermi liquid” near a QCP. We show that non- s -wave Landau parameters F_n with $n > 0$ diverge in the same way as m^*/m , and this renders the susceptibilities $\chi_{n>0}$ finite at an s -wave QCP. We argue that $1 + F_0$ vanishes at a QCP, but the slope is such that $1 + F_0 \sim \xi^{-2}(m^*/m)$. The susceptibility $\chi_{n=0} \propto (m^*/m)/(1 + F_0)$ still scales as ξ^2 , but the divergence is split between $m^*/m \sim \xi$ and $1/(1 + F_0) \sim \xi$. In the limit when the $(aq)^2$ term in V_{eff} is nearly eliminated by mass renormalization, one finds $m^*/m \sim \xi^2$, and $1 + F_0$ remains finite down almost to a QCP. In this situation, the divergence of the s -wave charge

susceptibility $\chi_{n=0}$ becomes entirely due to the divergence of m^*/m .

II. QUASIPARTICLE VERTEX FUNCTION

A. Conventional Fermi liquid away from a QCP




FIG. 1. The total, antisymmetrized vertex function.

We consider the system of itinerant fermions with dispersion ϵ_k and a static interaction $U(q)$, where q is the momentum transfer between incoming and outgoing fermions with the same spin projection. By definition, the vertex function $\Gamma_{\alpha\beta,\gamma\delta}(K, P, Q)$ is a fully dressed, anti-symmetrized 4-fermion interaction with vanishingly small momentum and frequency transfer $Q = (q, \omega_q)$. At first order in interaction, we have (see Fig. 1)

$$\Gamma_{\alpha\beta,\gamma\delta}(K, P, Q) = U(0)\delta_{\alpha\gamma}\delta_{\beta\delta} - U(K - P)\delta_{\alpha\delta}\delta_{\beta\gamma}. \quad (4)$$

Using basic spin algebra, this function can be split into spin and charge components in the particle-hole channel as

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{\alpha\beta,\gamma\delta}(K, P, Q) &= \Gamma_c(K, P, Q)\delta_{\alpha\gamma}\delta_{\beta\delta} + \Gamma_s(K, P, Q)\vec{\sigma}_{\alpha\gamma} \cdot \vec{\sigma}_{\beta\delta}, \\ \Gamma_c(K, P, Q) &= U(0) - \frac{1}{2}U(K - P), \quad \Gamma_s(K, P, Q) = -\frac{1}{2}U(K - P). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

We will ultimately need the vertex function in what is usually referred to as the ω limit, i.e. the limit when $q = 0$ and $\omega_q \rightarrow 0$. The order of limits is relevant when considering higher order diagrams (Figs. 2 and 3), as there is a class of nominally singular diagrams that




FIG. 2. The diagrams that contribute to Γ in the ω limit at second order in U .




FIG. 3. The diagrams that contribute to Γ in the ω limit at third order in U , neglecting diagrams that contain one or more particle-particle bubble as well as those that contain $\Pi_{ph}(q=0, \omega \rightarrow 0)$.

will not give a contribution in the ω limit. These “forbidden” diagrams contain a fermionic bubble with exactly zero momentum transfer: $\int d^2k d\omega G(k, \omega)G(k, \omega + \omega_q)$, which vanishes after the integration over frequency because the two poles are in the same frequency half-plane. We note that the same holds if we set $\omega_q = 0$, i.e., for this purpose the ω limit is equivalent to just setting $Q = 0$ in all diagrams for the vertex function.

The other diagrams in Fig. 2 are the ones that contain a particle-hole $\Pi_{ph}(\mathbf{k}_F - \mathbf{p}_F)$. At third order in U , there are diagrams which contain a mixture of particle-hole and particle-particle bubbles. Particle-particle bubbles are irrelevant near a $q=0$ particle-hole instability from a physics perspective, and we neglect them along with forbidden diagrams with particle-

hole bubbles with zero momentum transfer. This leaves series of diagrams that contain factors of $\Pi_{ph}(\mathbf{k}_F - \mathbf{p}_F)$. Third-order diagrams of this type are shown in Fig. 3. These diagrams can be summed up to all orders using the same strategy as in Ref. [17]. The result is the expression

$$\Gamma_{\alpha\beta,\gamma\delta}^{RPA}(K_F, P_F) = \frac{U(\mathbf{k}_F - \mathbf{p}_F)\vec{\sigma}_{\alpha\delta}\vec{\sigma}_{\beta\gamma}}{2(1 - U(\mathbf{k}_F - \mathbf{p}_F)\Pi_{ph}(K_F - P_F))} - \frac{U(\mathbf{k}_F - \mathbf{p}_F)\delta_{\alpha\delta}\delta_{\beta\gamma}}{2(1 + U(\mathbf{k}_F - \mathbf{p}_F)\Pi_{ph}(K_F - P_F))}. \quad (6)$$

where $K_F = (\mathbf{k}_F, \omega_k)$. As we said above, we call this vertex function Γ^{RPA} because it is obtained by summing up series of ladder and bubble diagrams.

An s-wave instability in the charge channel occurs at negative $U(0) = U$, when the static $U\Pi(q \rightarrow 0) = -1$ (we recall that we define static $\Pi(q)$ as positive). Near the instability the spin part of Γ is non-singular and may be neglected. Keeping only the charge part, we obtain

$$\Gamma_{\alpha\beta,\gamma\delta}^{RPA} \approx -\frac{U(\mathbf{k}_F - \mathbf{p}_F)\delta_{\alpha\delta}\delta_{\beta\gamma}}{2(1 + U(\mathbf{k}_F - \mathbf{p}_F)\Pi(K_F - P_F))} = V_{eff}(K_F - P_F)\delta_{\alpha\delta}\delta_{\beta\gamma} \quad (7)$$

We emphasize that at the RPA level, $\Pi_{ph}(Q)$ is constructed out of free fermions. Neglect-




FIG. 4. The effective interaction that arises from using the diagrams in Figs. 2 and 3 to form ladder and bubble series.

ing spin component of Γ^{RPA} is then legitimate only if there is a parameter range where charge component of Γ is larger than its spin component, and at the same time Fermi liquid

corrections are not strong enough to substantially affect $\Pi_{ph}(Q)$ compared to free fermion expression. We discuss this below.




FIG. 5. The two Aslamazov-Larkin type diagrams that give an essential correction to the vertex function in the case of the spin instability, but will cancel in the case of a charge instability.

To obtain the functional form of $V_{eff}(K_F - P_F)$ at small but finite $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{k} - \mathbf{p}$ and $\omega_q = \omega_k - \omega_p$, we assume that $U(\mathbf{q})$ is regular at small q , and that relevant $v_F q$ are larger than relevant ω_q . The dynamical part of $\Pi(Q)$ then has a form of a conventional Landau damping. Evaluating the polarization bubble for free fermions we then obtain

$$V_{eff}(Q) = \frac{k_F^2}{2N_F} \frac{1}{\xi^{-2} + a^2 q^2 + \gamma \frac{|\omega_q|}{|\mathbf{q}|}} \quad (8)$$

where $\gamma = k_F^2/v_F$, $a = O(1)$, and $\xi^{-2} = k_F^2(1 - N_F|U|)$, where N_F is the density of states at the Fermi surface ($\int d^2k/(2\pi)^2 = N_F \int d\epsilon_k$).

Note that spin indices on the Kronecker deltas and the Pauli matrices in Eq. (7) are different, compared to the first order expression, Eq. (5). If we write this term out in terms of the same spin indices as Eq. (5), we obtain

$$\Gamma_{\alpha\beta,\gamma\delta}^{RPA} = V_{eff}(K_F - P_F) (\delta_{\alpha\gamma}\delta_{\beta\delta} + \vec{\sigma}_{\alpha\gamma}\vec{\sigma}_{\beta\delta}). \quad (9)$$

We see that the spin and charge components of the vertex function are equal. This is consistent with the Fermi-liquid relations (2), which give

$$\int \Gamma_c(K_F, P)\{G^2(P)\}_\omega \frac{d^3P}{(2\pi)^3} = \int \Gamma_s(K_F, P)\{G^2(P)\}_\omega \frac{d^3P}{(2\pi)^3}. \quad (10)$$

In a Fermi liquid far away from a QCP, this would represent a complex integral relation between $\Gamma_c(K_F, P)$ and $\Gamma_s(K_F, P)$, where P is away from the Fermi surface. However, near a QCP, the dominant contribution to each integral comes from $P \approx P_F$ (more on this below). In this case, Eq. (10) requires $\Gamma_c(K_F, P_F)$ and $\Gamma_s(K_F, P_F)$ to be equal. This agrees with Eq. (9).

The equivalence between spin and charge component of $\Gamma_{\alpha\beta,\gamma\delta}^{RPA}$ does not hold for a $q = 0$ spin QCP (the one towards ferromagnetism). For the latter, spin and charge components of $\Gamma^{RPA}(K_F, P_F)$ differ by a factor of 3 [20]. The equivalence is restored once one uses $V_{eff}(K_F - P_F)$ for the dressed interaction and adds Aslamazov-Larkin diagrams, Fig. 5 (Refs. [16, 20]). For our case of a charge QCP, the two Aslamazov-Larkin contributions to the vertex function cancel each other [15]. Indeed, the contributions from the two diagrams in Fig. 5 are

$$I_a = \sum_{s,t} \delta_{\alpha s} \delta_{t\delta} \delta_{s\gamma} \delta_{\beta t} \int \frac{d^2q}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{d\Omega}{2\pi} V_{eff}(Q)^2 G(K+Q)G(P+Q) \quad (11)$$

$$I_b = \sum_{s,t} \delta_{\alpha s} \delta_{t\beta} \delta_{s\gamma} \delta_{t\delta} \int \frac{d^2q}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{d\Omega}{2\pi} V_{eff}(Q)^2 G(K+Q)G(P-Q), \quad (12)$$

For relevant P on the Fermi surface we have

$$G(P-Q) = \frac{1}{-i\omega_q + \mathbf{v}_F \cdot \mathbf{q}} = -G(P+Q), \quad (13)$$

One can then immediately verify that the contributions from the two diagrams are equal in magnitude but opposite in sign, i.e., the sum of the two contributions vanishes. For the spin case, where we have Pauli matrices at the vertices instead of Kronecker deltas, the two diagrams no longer have the same spin dependence, and the summation of the two yields a finite contribution.

III. QUASIPARTICLE RESIDUE Z AND EFFECTIVE MASS m^* WITHIN RPA

For a generic Fermi liquid, fermionic propagator at $T = 0$ at small ω_m and $k \approx k_F$ is

$$G(K) = \frac{Z}{i\omega_k - k_F(k - k_F)/m^*} \quad (14)$$




FIG. 6. The one loop approximation of the fermionic self energy, using the RPA vertex function as the interaction.

In this section we compute Z and m^*/m using Fermi liquid form of $G(K)$ and RPA forms of the effective interaction and the vertex function. We do computations in two ways: by evaluating fermionic self-energy and by using Eq. (2). We show that the results do not match. In the next section we argue that to restore the equivalence one needs to evaluate the vertex function Γ beyond RPA.

A. Z and m^*/m from the self-energy

The effective interaction $V_{eff}(Q)$ can be used to compute the fermionic self-energy. At one-loop order,

$$\Sigma(k, \omega_m) = - \int \frac{d^2q}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{d\omega_q}{2\pi} V_{eff}(Q) G(K + Q) \quad (15)$$

Subtracting $\Sigma(k_F, 0)$, which is irrelevant to our purposes, expressing $\Sigma(k, \omega_m)$ as $\Sigma(k, \omega_m) = \Sigma(k_F, 0) + \delta\Sigma(k, \omega_m)$, we obtain for $\delta\Sigma(k, \omega_m)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\Sigma(k, \omega_m) &= - \int \frac{d^2q}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{d\omega_q}{2\pi} V_{eff}(Q) (G(K + Q) - G(K_F + Q)) \\ &= - \frac{Zk_F^2}{2N_F} \int \frac{d^2q}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{d\omega_q}{2\pi} \frac{1}{\xi^{-2} + a^2q^2 + \gamma \frac{|\omega_q|}{q}} \frac{\varepsilon_k^* - i\omega_m}{(i(\omega_m + \omega_q) - \varepsilon_k^* - \mathbf{v}_F^* \cdot \mathbf{q}) (i\omega_q - \mathbf{v}_F^* \cdot \mathbf{q})}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Let's set $\omega_m > 0$ for definiteness. The momentum and frequency integral in (16) is ultra-violet convergent and can be evaluated in any order. It is convenient to do momentum

integration first. There are two contributions to the momentum integral: one comes from the poles in the fermionic propagators, and the other from the poles in the effective interaction. The two poles in the fermionic propagators are in different half-planes when ω_q is within the range $-\omega_m < \omega_q < 0$. Let's direct \mathbf{v}_F^* along x , i.e., write $\mathbf{v}_F^* \cdot \mathbf{q} = v_F^* q_x$ and momentarily neglect q_x and ω_q in the bosonic propagator. Evaluating the pole contribution and integrating over q_y in the bosonic propagator, we find

$$\delta\Sigma_f(k, \omega_m) = \frac{Zk_F^2}{2N_F v_F^*} i\omega_m \int \frac{dq_y}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{1}{\xi^{-2} + (aq_y)^2} = i\omega_m \lambda, \quad (17)$$

where $\lambda = (\xi k_F/4a)(Zm^*/m)$

We next verify whether it is legitimate to set $q_x = \omega_q = 0$ in the bosonic propagator. Typical ω_q in the pole contribution are of order ω_m and typical $q_x \sim \omega_m/v_F$. In the bosonic propagator, typical $q_y \sim \xi^{-1}$ and typical $\gamma|\omega_q|/|q| \sim (Zm^*/m)|\omega_m|/(v_F\xi^{-1})$. We see that at small enough ω_m , it is legitimate to set $\omega_q = 0$ and $q_x = 0$ in the bosonic propagator.

We further calculate the contribution to $\delta\Sigma$ from the pole in the effective interaction. Because the numerator in (16) already contains $\epsilon_k^* - i\omega_m$, we set ω_m and ϵ_k^* to 0 in the fermionic propagator. We then have

$$\delta\Sigma_b(k, \omega_m) = \frac{Zk_F^2}{2N_F} (i\omega_m - \epsilon_k^*) \int \frac{d^2q}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{d\omega_q}{2\pi} \frac{1}{\xi^{-2} + (aq)^2 + \gamma \frac{|\omega_q|}{q}} \frac{1}{(i\omega_q - \mathbf{v}_F^* \cdot \mathbf{q})^2} \quad (18)$$

Because the effective interaction does not depend on the angle between \mathbf{v}_F and \mathbf{q} , so we can do the angular integral first

$$\int \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \frac{1}{(i\omega_q - v_F^* q \cos \theta)^2} = -\frac{|\omega_q|}{(\omega_q^2 + (v_F^* q)^2)^{3/2}}. \quad (19)$$

[21] Substituting this back into (18), we find

$$\delta\Sigma_b(k, \omega_m) = -\frac{Zk_F^2}{2N_F} (i\omega_m - \epsilon_k^*) \int_0^\infty \frac{dq}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^\infty \frac{d\omega_q}{2\pi} \frac{q}{\xi^{-2} + (aq)^2 + \gamma \frac{|\omega_q|}{q}} \frac{|\omega_q|}{(\omega_q^2 + (v_F^* q)^2)^{3/2}} \quad (20)$$

Restricting integration over ω_q to positive frequencies and introducing polar coordinates $q = r \cos \phi$ and $\omega_q = v_F^* r \sin \phi$, we get

$$\delta\Sigma_b(k, \omega_m) = -\frac{Zk_F^2}{v_F^* N_F} (i\omega_m - \epsilon_k^*) \int \frac{dr d\phi}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{\cos \phi \sin \phi}{\xi^{-2} + (ar)^2 \cos^2 \phi + v_F^* \gamma \tan \phi} \quad (21)$$

Integrating over r and then over ϕ , we obtain

$$\delta\Sigma_b(k, \omega) = Z \left(\frac{m^*}{m} \right)^{3/2} (i\omega_m - \epsilon_k^*) f(\xi), \quad (22)$$

$$f(\xi) = -\frac{1}{4a} \left[\frac{\Gamma^2(3/4)}{\sqrt{\pi}} - \frac{2\Gamma^2(5/4)}{\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{m^*}{m(k_F\xi)^2} + \mathcal{O}\left(\left(m^*/(mk_F^2\xi^2)\right)^2\right) \right] \quad (23)$$

We see that there is an overall factor of $Z \left(\frac{m^*}{m} \right)^{3/2}$ in $\delta\Sigma_b(k, \omega)$. If we use this expression, combine $\delta\Sigma_f(k, \omega_m)$ and $\delta\Sigma_b(k, \omega_m)$ into $\delta\Sigma(k, \omega_m)$ and extract m^*/m and Z from $G^{-1}(k, \omega_m) = i\omega_m - \epsilon_k + \delta\Sigma(k, \omega_m) = (i\omega_m - \epsilon_k^*)/Z$, we obtain two self-consistent equations: one for Z and the other for m^*/m . They are

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{Z} &= 1 + \lambda + f(\xi)Z \left(\frac{m^*}{m} \right)^{3/2} \\ \frac{m^*}{m} &= \frac{1}{Z} - f(\xi)Z \left(\frac{m^*}{m} \right)^{3/2} \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

We need to solve this set together with Eq. (23). Solving, we obtain

$$m^*/m = 1 + \lambda, \quad \frac{1}{Z} \approx 1 + \lambda + f(\xi)\sqrt{\lambda}, \quad f(\xi) \approx -\frac{1}{4a} \frac{\Gamma^2(3/4)}{\sqrt{\pi}}. \quad (25)$$

To leading order in λ , we then have $m^*/m \approx 1/Z$. We see that mass renormalization is entirely determined by the quasiparticle residue. This is the consequence of the fact that ϵ_k itself changes by $\epsilon_k(1 + f(\xi)Z(m^*/m)^{1/2})$. The correction term scales as $1/\sqrt{\lambda}$ and is small.

A closer look shows that we must be more careful when evaluating $\delta\Sigma_b(k, \omega_m)$. In the integral over r , the dominant contributions come from $r \sim k_F\sqrt{m/m^*}$, and therefore, relevant $\omega_q \sim E_F(m/m^*)^{3/2}$. The Fermi liquid fermionic Green's function, given in Eq. (14), is only valid in the regime where the fermionic self-energy is approximately linear in frequency. This holds when frequency is smaller than $\omega_{FL} = (E_F/a)/(k_F\xi)^3$. Near the QCP, m^*/m is large and relevant ω_q are above the upper edge of the Fermi liquid behavior. Number-wise, Eq. (25) is still valid in some range of $\lambda > 1$, but close enough to the QCP, we cannot use Fermi liquid form of the Green's function and have to use instead quantum-critical, non-Fermi liquid form $\Sigma(k = k_F, \omega) = i\omega_0^{1/3}|\omega_m|^{2/3}$. This form replaces $\Sigma_f(k_F, \omega_m)$ at $|\omega_m| > \omega_{FL}$, i.e., above the upper edge of the Fermi liquid regime. We present the calculation as we will need to know the dependence of ω_0 on our parameter a . To get $\delta\Sigma_f(k_F, \omega_m)$ in the

quantum-critical regime, which we label as $\delta\Sigma_{NFL}(k_F, \omega_m)$, we set $\xi^{-1} = 0$ and express the pole contribution to the self-energy as

$$\delta\Sigma_{NFL}(k_F, \omega_m) = \frac{ik_F^2\omega_m}{2N_F} \int \frac{d^2q d\omega_q}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{\left(a^2q^2 + \gamma\frac{|\omega_q|}{q}\right) (i(\omega_m + \omega_q) - \mathbf{v}_F \cdot \mathbf{q}) (i\omega_q - \mathbf{v}_F \cdot \mathbf{q})} \quad (26)$$

One can easily make sure that the dominant contribution to the integral comes from setting $q_x = 0$ in the bosonic propagator. Integrating then over q_x in the fermionic propagators, we obtain

$$\delta\Sigma_{NFL}(k_F, \omega_m) = \frac{ik_F^2}{4\pi N_F v_F a^2} \int_0^{\omega_m} d\omega_q \int_0^\infty dq_y \frac{q_y}{q_y^3 + \gamma\omega_q/a^2} \quad (27)$$

Doing both integrals over q_y and ω_q , we then obtain

$$\delta\Sigma_{NFL}(k_F, \omega_m) = \frac{i\pi(k_F v_F)^{1/3}}{2a^{4/3}\sqrt{3}} |\omega_m|^{2/3} = i\omega_0^{1/3} |\omega_m|^{2/3}, \quad \omega_0 = \frac{\pi^3 E_F}{12\sqrt{3}a^4} \quad (28)$$

This result for ω_0 is consistent with the requirement that the self energy crosses over smoothly from Fermi liquid to Non Fermi liquid behavior at $|\omega_n| = \omega_{FL}$. We now use $\Sigma_{NFL}(k_F, \omega_m)$ to calculate the contribution to the momentum-dependent part of $\delta\Sigma_b$ from the regime $\omega_q > \omega_{FL}$. We have

$$\delta\Sigma_b(k, 0) = -\frac{k_F^2 \varepsilon_k}{2N_F} \int \frac{d^2q}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{d\omega_q}{2\pi} \frac{1}{a^2q^2 + \gamma\frac{|\omega_q|}{q}} \frac{1}{\left(i|\omega_q|^{2/3}\omega_0^{1/3} - \mathbf{v}_F^* \cdot \mathbf{q}\right)^2}, \quad (29)$$

Restricting the ω_q integral to positive values, we may replace the lower limit by 0 if typical values of ω_q are much larger than ω_{FL} . In our case $\omega_{q,typ}/\omega_{FL} \approx (3072\sqrt{3}/\pi^3)a^6$, which we assume to be larger than one. Again evaluating the integration over the angle between \mathbf{v}_F and \mathbf{q} first, we now obtain

$$\delta\Sigma_b(k, 0) = \frac{k_F^2 \varepsilon_k}{2N_F} \int \frac{dq}{2\pi} \frac{d\omega_q}{2\pi} \frac{q}{a^2q^2 + \gamma\frac{|\omega_q|}{q}} \frac{\omega_q^{2/3}\omega_0^{1/3}}{\left(v_F^2 q^2 + (\omega_q^{2/3}\omega_0^{1/3})^2\right)^{3/2}}. \quad (30)$$

With the change of variables $\omega_q = \sqrt{v_F^3 z^3/\omega_0}$, the above expression becomes

$$\delta\Sigma_b(k, 0) = \frac{3k_F^2 \varepsilon_k}{2N_F (2\pi)^2} \sqrt{\frac{1}{v_F \omega_0}} \int_0^\infty dq dz \frac{z^{3/2} q^2}{a^2 q^3 + \gamma \sqrt{\frac{v_F^3 z^3}{\omega_0}}} \frac{1}{(q^2 + z^2)^{3/2}}. \quad (31)$$

Converting this to polar coordinates, $q = r \cos \phi$ and $z = r \sin \phi$, we then have

$$\delta\Sigma_b(k, 0) = \frac{3k_F^2 \varepsilon_k}{2N_F (2\pi)^2} \sqrt{\frac{1}{v_F \omega_0}} \int_0^{\pi/2} d\phi \int_0^\infty dr \frac{\cos^2 \phi \sin^{3/2} \phi}{a^2 r^{3/2} \cos^3 \phi + \gamma \sqrt{\frac{v_F^3}{\omega_0}} \sin^{3/2} \phi}. \quad (32)$$

Integrating over r and then over ϕ , we find

$$\delta\Sigma_b(k, 0) = \varepsilon_k \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \left(\frac{k_F v_F}{a^4 \omega_0} \right)^{1/3} = \varepsilon_k \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \left(\frac{2E_F}{a^4 \omega_0} \right)^{1/3}. \quad (33)$$

To obtain the final expression for $\delta\Sigma(k, 0)$, we now need to know the exact value of ω_0 . To do so, we calculate the frequency dependence of the fermionic self-energy in the non-Fermi liquid regime, i.e. when $\xi^{-2} = 0$. Inserting ω_0 from (28), we find

$$\delta\Sigma_b(k, 0) = \frac{2}{\pi} \varepsilon_k \approx 0.64 \varepsilon_k. \quad (34)$$

In earlier calculations of $\delta\Sigma_b(k, 0) \propto \varepsilon_k$ in the quantum-critical regime near a $q = 0$ instability [22] it was assumed that the interaction is sufficiently long-ranged such that the instability develops when fermion-boson coupling $|U|$ is much smaller than the Fermi energy. In this situation, the prefactor for ε_k in $\delta\Sigma_b(k, 0)$ is small in $(|U|/E_F)^{1/2}$, and $\delta\Sigma_b(k, 0)$ can be neglected. In our case, the interaction is short-ranged, critical $|U|$ is $1/N_F$, and $\delta\Sigma_b(k, 0)/\varepsilon_k$ is a number of order one, which has to be kept when we determine m^*/m and Z .

Using the above forms for the self-energy and solving the equation $G^{-1}(k, \omega_m) = i\omega_m - \varepsilon_k + \delta\Sigma(k, \omega_m) = (i\omega_m - \varepsilon_k^*)/Z$, we obtain

$$\frac{m^*}{m} = \frac{1}{Z} \frac{1}{1 - 2/\pi}, \quad \frac{1}{Z} = 1 + \lambda = 1 + \frac{\xi k_F}{4a} \frac{Z m^*}{m} \quad (35)$$

Solving this set we find that both Z^{-1} and m^*/m scale linearly with ξ at large λ , but with different prefactors. As a consequence, $Z m^*/m$ still tends to a constant value at $\xi = \infty$, but this value is different from one.

To simplify our analysis, below we assume that at $\lambda > 1$ the correction $\delta\Sigma_b(k, \omega)$ still comes from fermions within the Fermi liquid regime. In this case, Eq. (25) is valid and $Z m^*/m \approx 1$. One can check higher-order self-energy corrections, which come from series of vertex renormalizations. The strongest ones at each loop order also scale as $\lambda \omega$ at large $k_F \xi$, but the prefactors do not form a particular series and very likely do not change qualitatively

the one-loop result. We therefore consider $\delta\Sigma(k, \omega_m) = i\omega_m\lambda$ with $\lambda \sim (k_F\xi)$ as the full result for the self-energy in a Fermi liquid.

We can now identify the applicability range of RPA treatment as the one in which $k_F\xi > 1$, but $\lambda < 1$, i.e., where $1 < (k_F\xi) < 4a$.

B. Z from the vertex function

We now check which value of the quasiparticle residue we get if we use Γ^{RPA} and use Fermi-liquid relations, Eq. (2). We assume that the relation $Zm^*/m = 1$ holds and solve for Z

The integrals in the r.h.s of Eq. (2) reduce to

$$J = \int \frac{d^3P}{(2\pi)^3} V_{eff}(K_F - P) \{G(P)^2\}_\omega = \quad (36)$$

$$\frac{Z^2 k_F^2}{2N_F} \int \frac{d^2q}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{d\omega_q}{2\pi} \frac{1}{\xi^{-2} + (aq)^2 + \gamma \frac{|\omega_q|}{q}} \frac{1}{(i\omega_q - \mathbf{v}_F^* \cdot \mathbf{q})} \frac{1}{(i(\omega_q + \omega) - \mathbf{v}_F^* \cdot \mathbf{q})} \Big|_{\omega \rightarrow 0} \quad (37)$$

This is very similar to the expression for the self energy. We verified that, like there, the dominant contribution comes from the pole in the fermionic propagator. Evaluating the integral in the same way as we did for $\delta\Sigma_f$, we obtain

$$J = \frac{Z^2 k_F^2}{2v_F^* N_F} \int \frac{dq_y}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{1}{\xi^{-2} + (aq_y)^2} = Z\lambda. \quad (38)$$

Substituting into (2), we obtain the self-consistent relation

$$\frac{1}{Z} = 1 + Z\lambda \quad (39)$$

whose solution at $\lambda \gg 1$ is $Z \sim 1/\sqrt{\lambda}$. This is different from $Z \sim 1/\lambda$, which we earlier extracted from the self-energy.

IV. EFFECTIVE INTERACTION AND VERTEX FUNCTION BEYOND RPA

We now argue that at large ξ , when Z is small and m^*/m is large, one has to include Fermi liquid renormalizations in the calculation of the polarization $\Pi_{ph}(Q)$, which determines V_{eff} ,

and also include additional renormalizations of the vertex function, which make it different from V_{eff} and, as we show below, restores the equivalence between the two calculations of the Z factor.

A. Effective interaction

We begin with V_{eff} . We consider separately how Fermi-liquid renormalizations affect the Landau damping term, the ξ^{-2} term, and the $(aq)^2$ term in (8).

The Landau damping term comes exclusively from low-energy fermions with energies smaller than ω_q , and the prefactor γ can be computed using Eq. (14) for the Green's function. The result is $\gamma = (Zm^*/m)^2 k_F^2 / v_F$. For $Zm^*/m = 1$ the Landau damping term retains the same value as for free fermions.

The ξ^{-2} term also does not renormalize. We recall that $\xi^{-2} = k_F^2(1 - |U(0)|\Pi(0))$. For the case when the self-energy predominantly depends on frequency, $\Pi(0)$ can be computed by integrating first over fermionic dispersion ϵ_k over a range $|\epsilon_k| < W$, where W is of order bandwidth:

$$\Pi(q \rightarrow 0) = -N_F \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\omega_m}{2\pi} \int_{-W}^W d\epsilon_k \frac{1}{(i(\omega_m + \Sigma(\omega_m)) - \epsilon_k)^2}$$

We approximated the momentum integral as $\int d^2k \approx N_F \int d\epsilon_k$. The integral over ϵ_k can be easily evaluated, and is determined by $|\epsilon_k| \sim W$. The corresponding ω_m are then also of order W . At such high energies, the self-energy is irrelevant and $G(k, \omega)$ can be approximated by its free-fermion form. Evaluating explicitly the frequency integral we then obtain $\Pi(0) = N_F$, like in RPA. One can obtain the same result by integrating over ω_m first, but then one has to include contributions from both low-energy and high-energy fermions, and the two contributions partly cancel each other [15].

The $(aq)^2$ term has two contributions. One comes from low-energy fermions, another from fermions with energies of order bandwidth [19]. The low-energy contribution gets reduced by m/m^* once we add Fermi liquid renormalizations [18]. The high-energy contribution remains intact. As a result, the prefactor a gets reduced but remains finite, though for the cases considered in Ref. [19], this finite value is numerically quite small. Below we keep a as

a parameter, but comment on the case when a is small.

The outcome of this analysis is that after Fermi liquid renormalizations, V_{eff} retains the same form as in (8). Accordingly, the analysis in the previous Section remains valid.

B. Vertex function

We next consider the renormalization of the relation between the vertex function Γ and V_{eff} , or, equivalently, between Γ and Γ^{RPA} . We argue, following Refs. [15, 16] that at large λ , there are additional relevant diagrams for the vertex function. These additional diagrams contain a polarization bubble with zero momentum transfer (Fig. 7). In a weakly coupled Fermi liquid, these bubbles are convoluted with the static $U(q)$ and vanish after integration over frequency because they contain a double pole in either only upper or only lower frequency half-plane. In a critical Fermi liquid, the product $G^2(K + Q)$ is convoluted with the dynamical $V_{eff}(Q)$. The latter contains branch cuts in both half planes of complex frequency, so the existence of a double pole in only one half plane cannot be used to determine whether or not these contributions vanish. Let's consider the lowest-order diagram, with one




FIG. 7. The sum over ladder diagrams using the effective RPA interaction. Note that these diagrams all evaluate to zero when considering a static interaction, but due to the branch cut in the RPA vertex function, will give finite results.

insertion of $G^2(K + Q)$ (left panel of Fig. 7). We label its contribution to Γ as $Y^{(2)}$. Like we did before, we set external K and P on the Fermi surface, i.e., set $\omega_k = \omega_p = 0$ and

$|\mathbf{k}| = |\mathbf{p}| = k_F$. We assume that $Y^{(2)}$ largely comes from internal fermions near the Fermi surface and use Fermi-liquid form for $G(K + Q)$. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
Y^{(2)} &= \int \frac{d^2q}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{d\omega_q}{2\pi} G(K + Q)^2 V_{eff}(Q) V_{eff}(P - K - Q) \\
&= \frac{k_F^4}{4N_F^2} \int \frac{d^2q}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{d\omega_q}{2\pi} \frac{Z^2}{(i\omega_q - \mathbf{v}_F^* \cdot \mathbf{q})^2} \frac{1}{\xi^{-2} + a^2 q^2 + \gamma \frac{|\omega_q|}{q}} \frac{1}{\xi^{-2} + a^2 (\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q})^2 + \gamma \frac{|\omega_q|}{|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}|}}
\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

$$\tag{41}$$

The velocity \mathbf{v}_F is directed along \mathbf{k} . For definiteness, we set \mathbf{k} along x . We assume and verify that relevant $|\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{p}|$ are of order ξ^{-1} , i.e., are much smaller than k_F . Then $\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{p}$ is directed along y and its magnitude is approximately $k_F \theta$, where θ is the angle between \mathbf{k} and \mathbf{p} , over which we will have to integrate later in Eq. (2). The $G^2(K + Q)$ has to be understood as the product of two Green's function with exactly the same momenta and infinitesimally small difference in frequencies, $\epsilon > 0$, i.e., $1/(i\omega_q - \mathbf{v}_F^* \cdot \mathbf{q})^2 \rightarrow 1/((i\omega_q - \mathbf{v}_F^* \cdot \mathbf{q})(i(\omega_q + \epsilon) - \mathbf{v}_F^* \cdot \mathbf{q}))$. The integral in (41) is ultra-violet convergent and can be evaluated by integrating first either over frequency or over momentum. Integrating over q_x first, we find two contributions, $Y_1^{(2)}$ and $Y_2^{(2)}$. The first contribution comes from integrating over infinitesimally small q_x , when the poles in the two Green's functions are in different half-planes. This holds when ω_q is in the infinitesimally narrow range $-\epsilon < \omega_q < 0$. This contribution then obviously comes from static V_{eff} , in which we can also set $q_x = 0$. In explicit form,

$$Y_1^{(2)} = \frac{Z^2 k_F^4}{4v_F^* N_F^2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dq_y}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{1}{\xi^{-2} + a^2 q_y^2} \frac{1}{\xi^{-2} + a^2 (k_F \theta + q_y)^2} = Z \lambda \frac{k_F^2}{2N_F} \frac{2}{4\xi^{-2} + (ak_F \theta)^2} \tag{42}$$

The second contribution, $Y_2^{(2)}$ comes from the pole in the interaction, viewed as a function of q_x . For this contribution, one can set $\epsilon = 0$. For static interaction, the contribution from this pole cancels out $Y_1^{(2)}$, as expected. One can confirm this by taking $Y_2^{(2)}$ with static V_{eff} by integrating over q_x first, in infinite limits, and closing the contour in the upper half plane when $\omega_q < 0$ and in the lower half plane when $\omega_q > 0$ in order to include only the contributions from the poles in the interaction. After performing subsequent elementary integrals over ω_q and then q_y , one obtains precisely the same result as for $Y_1^{(2)}$ but with an overall minus sign. However, in the presence of Landau damping term in V_{eff} , one can easily verify that $Y_2^{(2)}$ is reduced by $1/(k_F \xi)$ as characteristic q_y become of order k_F rather than ξ^{-1} . As the consequence, at large ξ , $Y_2^{(2)} \ll Y_1^{(2)}$ and $Y^{(2)} \approx Y_1^{(2)}$, given by (42).

We also considered an additional second order diagram, one that takes the same form as $Y^{(2)}$ but with the interactions crossed. We evaluated this diagram both by integrating over frequency first and by doing an analogous calculation with the above one for $Y^{(2)}$ - both methods showed that this diagram does not contain an overall factor of λ as in the case of $Y^{(2)}$. Calculations for higher diagrams of the same type would proceed in a similar way, so we neglect these crossed diagrams.

Higher-order diagrams from the ladder series can be computed the same way as Y^2 . For an n th order diagram we have

$$Y^{(n)} = \int \frac{d^2q_1}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{d\omega_1}{2\pi} \cdots \frac{d^2q_{n-1}}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{d\omega_{n-1}}{2\pi} G^2(K + Q_1) \cdots G^2(K + Q_{n-1}) \quad (43)$$

$$\times V_{eff}(Q_1) V_{eff}(Q_2 - Q_1) \cdots V_{eff}(P - K - Q_{n-1}),$$

The largest contribution, of order $(Z\lambda)^{n-1}$, again comes from integration over infinitesimally small q_y and ω_q in each cross-section, when the poles in the corresponding $G^2(K + Q_i)$, with frequencies split by $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, are in different half-planes. Integrating, we obtain

$$Y^{(n)} = \left(\frac{Z^2 m^* k_F}{8\pi m} \right)^{n-1} \frac{k_F^2}{2N_F} \int dq_{1,y} \cdots \int dq_{n-1,y} \frac{1}{\xi^{-2} + a^2 q_{1,y}^2}$$

$$\times \frac{1}{\xi^{-2} + a^2 (q_{2,y} - q_{1,y})^2} \cdots \frac{1}{\xi^{-2} + a^2 (k_F \theta + q_{n-1,y})^2}$$

$$= \left(\frac{Z^2 \xi m^* k_F}{8ma} \right)^{n-1} \frac{k_F^2}{2N_F} \frac{n}{n^2 \xi^{-2} + (ak_F \theta)^2} = (Z\lambda)^{n-1} \frac{k_F}{2N_F} \frac{n}{n^2 \xi^{-2} + (ak_F \theta)^2} \quad (44)$$

We now recall that to get the contribution to $1/Z$ using Eq. (2), we need to integrate each term in the series over θ . Because

$$\int d\theta \frac{n}{n^2 \xi^{-2} + (ak_F \theta)^2} = \int d\theta \frac{1}{\xi^{-2} + (ak_F \theta)^2}, \quad (45)$$

the last term in $Y^{(n)}$ with every n can be replaced by $1/(\xi^{-2} + (ak_F \theta)^2)$. Identifying $V_{eff}(K_f - P_f) = (k_F^2/2N_F)1/(\xi^{-2} + (ak_F \theta)^2)$ with $Y^{(n=1)}$, combining with $Y^{(n)}$ with $n \geq 2$, and restoring spin indices, we obtain the full vertex function in the form

$$\Gamma_{\alpha\beta,\gamma\delta} = \Gamma_{\alpha\beta,\gamma\delta}^{RPA} Y \quad (46)$$

where

$$Y = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (Z\lambda)^{n-1} = \frac{1}{1 - Z\lambda} \quad (47)$$

The relation is the same for charge and spin components of Γ . Substituting into (2) we obtain, instead of (39),

$$\frac{1}{Z} = 1 + \frac{Z\lambda}{1 - Z\lambda} = \frac{1}{1 - Z\lambda} \quad (48)$$

whose solution is $Z = 1/(1 + \lambda)$. This is precisely the same result that we obtained from the self-energy. We remind that $\lambda = (k_F\xi/4a)(Zm^*/m) \sim (k_F\xi/4a)$. Substituting into (47) we find $Y = 1/(1 - Z\lambda) = 1/Z$.

Eq. (46) is the central result of this paper. We caution, however, that this simple relation between the full $\Gamma(K, P)$ and $\Gamma^{RPA}(K, P)$ holds only for the vertex function at small momentum transfer between \mathbf{k} and \mathbf{p} . This is sufficient for the calculation of $1/Z$ using (2), but for a generic $|\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{p}| \sim k_F$, the computational procedure is more involved and the relation between Γ and Γ^{RPA} is more complex.

We also note that the ratio m^*/m can be also obtained in a microscopic Fermi liquid theory. We don't present the calculations (they are similar to the ones for $1/Z$, see Ref. [7]) and cite only the final result:

$$\frac{m^*}{m} = 1 + \frac{Z\lambda}{1 - Z\lambda} \quad (49)$$

Substituting $Z = 1/(1 + \lambda)$ we immediately find $m^*/m = 1 + \lambda = 1/Z$.

There is one more addition due to dynamical nature of the effective interaction near a QCP. We remind that the vertex function $\Gamma^\omega(K, P; K, P)$ is the fully renormalized antisymmetrized interaction, i.e., the difference between fully renormalized interaction at zero momentum transfer and vanishingly small frequency transfer and the fully renormalized interaction at finite momentum/frequency transfer $K - P$. In the analysis above we obtained within RPA and then further renormalized the term in Γ^ω that depends on the 2D momentum transfer $K - P$. At the RPA level, there is no contribution to Γ^ω from vanishingly small 2D momentum transfer because the corresponding polarization bubbles vanish in the ω -limit. The situation changes once we renormalize the bubble with zero momentum transfer by dynamical interaction V_{eff} . We show a representative of such diagrams in Fig. 8. Now the frequency integral does not vanish because of the branch cut in V_{eff} in both half-planes of complex frequency. As the consequence, there is an additional contribution to charge




FIG. 8. An example of a diagram that has zero momentum transfer and will contribute to only F_0 , but none of the other Landau parameters or Z .

component of $\Gamma^\omega(K, P)$ that does not depend on the 2D momentum transfer. We label this contribution as $Ck_F^2/(2N_F)$. Combining with (46) we obtain the full Γ^ω near QCP in the form

$$\Gamma_{\alpha\beta,\gamma\delta}^\omega = \frac{k_F^2}{4N_F} \left(\frac{1}{Z} \frac{1}{\xi^{-2} + (aq)^2 + \gamma \frac{|\omega_q|}{|\mathbf{q}|}} - C \right) \delta_{\alpha\gamma} \delta_{\beta\delta} \quad (50)$$

$$+ \frac{k_F^2}{4N_F} \left(\frac{1}{Z} \frac{1}{\xi^{-2} + (aq)^2 + \gamma \frac{|\omega_q|}{|\mathbf{q}|}} \right) \vec{\sigma}_{\alpha\gamma} \vec{\sigma}_{\beta\delta}. \quad (51)$$

The constant term C does not affect Eq. (2) because the integral in the r.h.s of (2) vanishes once we substitute a constant for Γ . The same is true for the Fermi-liquid relation between Γ and m^*/m . The analysis in this section then remains intact. For this reason, we didn't attempt to obtain the explicit expression for C . However, the constant term is essential for proper calculation of the Landau parameter F_0 in a critical Fermi liquid in the next section.

V. CRITICAL FERMI LIQUID

We now describe the implementation of our expressions for V_{eff} and Γ for a Fermi liquid theory near a QCP when λ is large, and the dynamics of V_{eff} plays the crucial role in self-consistent calculations of Z and m^*/m . Following [15], we call this a critical Fermi liquid in order to distinguish it from a conventional Fermi liquid, for which V_{eff} can be approximated by its static form. In our notations, conventional Fermi liquid regime holds when $\lambda < 1$ and critical Fermi liquid regime holds for $\lambda > 1$.

The two issues we discuss here are (i) the expressions for Landau parameters F_n and G_n in charge and spin channels with angular momentum n and (ii) the forms of static charge and spin susceptibilities $\chi_{c,n}$ and $\chi_{s,n}$.

The Landau parameters F_n and G_n are partial components of the Landau function $f_{\alpha\beta,\gamma\delta}(|\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{p}|)$, in which both momenta are on the Fermi surface. The Landau function f is related to static Γ^ω as

$$f_{\alpha\beta,\gamma\delta}(|\mathbf{k}_F - \mathbf{p}_F|) = 2N_F Z^2 \frac{m^*}{m} \Gamma^\omega(K_F, P_F) \quad (52)$$

with $K_F = (\mathbf{k}_F, 0)$. The partial components are obtained by integrating charge and spin components of f with $\cos(n\theta)$, where θ is the angle between Fermi surface momenta \mathbf{k} and \mathbf{p} .

For partial components with $n > 0$, the constant term in Γ^ω in (50) is irrelevant as the integral vanishes. Keeping only the momentum-dependent term in the r.h.s. of (50) and using $Zm^*/m = 1$, we obtain

$$F_n = G_n = \frac{k_F^2}{4\pi} \int d\theta \frac{\cos n\theta}{\xi^{-2} + 2(ak_F)^2(1 - \cos\theta)} \quad (53)$$

Following [15], we find that for not too large $n < n_c \sim \lambda a^2$,

$$F_n = G_n \approx \frac{k_F \xi}{4a} = \lambda \quad (54)$$

We see that Landau parameters scale as λ , i.e., diverge upon system approach to a QCP.

The corresponding susceptibilities are

$$\chi_{n,c} = \chi_{n,c}^{(0)} \frac{\frac{m^*}{m}}{1 + F_n} + \chi_{inc,c}; \quad \chi_{n,s} = \chi_{n,s}^{(0)} \frac{\frac{m^*}{m}}{1 + G_n} + \chi_{inc,s}, \quad (55)$$

where $\chi_{n,c}^{(0)}$ and $\chi_{n,s}^{(0)}$ are partial susceptibilities of free fermions and χ_{inc} is the component of susceptibility that comes from high-energy fermions, outside the applicability range of Fermi liquid theory.

We see from (55) that $1 + F_n = 1 + G_n = 1 + \lambda$ cancel out singular mass renormalization $m^*/m = 1 + \lambda$. As a result, all non-s-wave susceptibilities remain finite at an s -wave QCP. This result is fully expected on physical grounds. We emphasize that the presence of the extra factor $1/Z$ between Γ and V_{eff} in (46) plays the crucial role here. Without such factor, we would not have found a cancellation between m^*/m and $1 + F_n$ or $1 + G_n$.

The same analysis holds for s -wave spin component. We have $G_0 \approx \lambda$, such that $\chi_{0,s}$ remains approximately equal to susceptibility of free fermions.

For the $n = 0$ charge component, we obtain

$$F_0 \approx \lambda - \frac{C}{2} \frac{k_F^2}{1 + \lambda} \quad (56)$$

At an s -wave charge QCP we must have $F_0 = -1$. This requirement is met if $C = 2(1 + \lambda)^2/k_F^2 + O(1/(ak_F)^2)$, which we assume to hold. Substituting into (56) we obtain

$$1 + F_0 \sim \frac{1}{a^2(1 + \lambda)} \sim \frac{1}{ak_F\xi}. \quad (57)$$

Substituting this into the expression for the charge susceptibility, we then obtain

$$\frac{\chi_{0,c}}{\chi^{(0)}} = \frac{\frac{m^*}{m}}{1 + F_0} \sim ((1 + \lambda)a)^2 \sim (k_F\xi)^2 \quad (58)$$

where $\chi^{(0)}$ is the susceptibility of free fermions. We see that the s -wave charge susceptibility diverges as ξ^2 near a QCP. The divergence is the same as we would obtain within RPA, by extracting charge susceptibility from the effective interaction $V_{eff}(Q = 0) \propto \xi^2$. We see however that the divergence is now split between $m^*/m \sim \xi$ and $1/(1 + F_0) \sim \xi$. In other words, as long as RPA description is valid (i.e., as long as $\lambda \leq 1$) both $m^*/m \approx 1$ and $(1 + F_0) \sim \xi^{-2}$. Closer to QCP, when λ increases and m^*/m becomes large, the slope of $(1 + F_0)$ changes to $(1 + F_0) \sim \xi^{-1}$.

This behavior becomes more exotic in the limit when the prefactor a in the RPA expression for V_{eff} predominantly comes from low-energy fermions, and nearly vanishes in a critical Fermi liquid. In this situation, $m^*/m \sim \lambda \sim \xi^2$. This behavior is reproduced if we set in

a critical Fermi liquid $a \sim (k_F \xi)^{-1}$. Then $(1 + F_0) \sim 1/(ak_F \xi)$ (Eq. (57)) saturates at a constant value instead of vanishing. The charge susceptibility still diverges at a QCP as ξ^2 , but the divergence now comes exclusively from the effective mass. This limit, however, is somewhat artificial as at $a \rightarrow 0$ susceptibilities in all channels diverge at a QCP, i.e., a critical point becomes multi-dimensional.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In this communication we considered a system close to a $q = 0$ charge QCP. We have shown here that near a QCP, when the correlation length ξ for charge fluctuations is large compared to $1/k_F$, the system enters into a critical Fermi liquid regime. In this regime, excitations are still coherent at the smallest frequencies and the quasiparticle Z -factor tends to a finite value at $\omega \rightarrow 0$. But the vertex function – the one that determines the residue –, the mass renormalization, and the thermodynamic properties at the lowest energies become different from the ones in a conventional Fermi liquid. Specifically, the Landau damping of the effective interaction, mediated by order parameter fluctuations, plays a crucial role. Because of the Landau damping, contributions to the vertex function, which vanish in conventional Fermi liquid theory, now become non-zero. Near a QCP, summing up a ladder series of these formally forbidden contributions increases the vertex function by $1/Z \propto (\xi k_F)$. We demonstrated that the Z factor, obtained self-consistently from microscopic Fermi liquid theory, based on Ward identities, is equivalent to Z extracted from the quasiparticle self-energy. The extra ladder diagrams are crucial for this equivalence. We also argued that the charge component of the full vertex function Γ^ω has an additional constant term with a prefactor that scales as ξ^2 . This additional term does not affect the Fermi liquid relations between $1/Z$ (and m^*/m) and the vertex function, but must be kept to satisfy the condition that the Landau parameter F_0 must approach -1 at the QCP (except one special case, which we discussed at the end of the previous section). All other Landau parameters F_n and G_n diverge near a QCP in the same way as m^*/m . The cancellation of divergencies between m^*/m and $1 + F_n$ for charge susceptibilities and $1 + G_n$ for spin susceptibilities ensures that these susceptibilities remain finite at an s -wave charge QCP, in line with common sense

reasoning.

Our results are comparable to prior works in which the full Γ was obtained in a critical FL for d -wave nematic order [15, 20] and (π, π) antiferromagnetic order [16]. Compared to these previous cases, the s-wave charge QCP allows for explicit evaluation of the vertex function and yields results that illustrate the problem with more clarity. The analytical calculations presented here are controlled, and the solution explicitly resolves the apparent discrepancy found at the level of RPA between the fermionic self energy and the vertex function.

-
- [1] A. A. Abrikosov, L. P. Gorkov, and I. E. Dzyaloshinski, *Methods of Quantum Field Theory in Statistical Physics* (Dover Publications, New York, 1963).
 - [2] E. M. Lifshitz and L. P. Pitaevskii, *Statistical Physics Part 2*, 3rd ed., Vol. 9 (Elsevier, 1980).
 - [3] D. Pines and P. Nozieres, *The Theory of Quantum Liquids* (Benjamin, New York, 1966).
 - [4] G. Baym and C. Pethick, *Landau Fermi-Liquid Theory* (John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1991).
 - [5] L. D. Landau, Sov. Phys. JETP **3**, 920 (1956); **5**, 101 (1957); **8**, 70 (1959).
 - [6] L. P. Pitaevskii, Sov. Phys. JETP **10**, 1267 (1960); J. Low Temp. Phys. **164**, 173 (2011).
 - [7] A. V. Chubukov, A. Klein, and D. L. Maslov, Journal of Experimental and Theoretical Physics **127**, 826 (2018).
 - [8] The vertex function, related to quasiparticle Z by Ward identity, is often defined as Γ^ω : the limit $Q \rightarrow 0$ of $\Gamma_{\alpha\beta,\gamma\delta}(K, P; k - Q, k + Q)$ with $Q = (\omega, q)$ taken at $q = 0$ and finite ω . This definition implies that Γ^ω has no split low-energy poles in different frequency half-planes. One can easily verify that to satisfy this constraint one can set both ω and q to zero instead of setting $q = 0$ and keeping ω small but finite.
 - [9] P. S. Kondratenko, Sov. Phys. JETP **19**, 972 (1964); **20**, 1032 (1965).
 - [10] I. Dzyaloshinskii and A. Larkin, Sov. Phys. JETP **38**, 202 (1974).
 - [11] J. A. Hertz, Phys. Rev. B **14**, 1165 (1976).
 - [12] W. Metzner, D. Rohe, and S. Andergassen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 066402 (2003).
 - [13] C. Nayak and F. Wilczek, Nuclear Physics B **417**, 359 (1994).
 - [14] A. Klein, A. V. Chubukov, Y. Schattner, and E. Berg, Phys. Rev. X **10**, 031053 (2020).

- [15] D. L. Maslov and A. V. Chubukov, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 045110 (2010).
- [16] A. V. Chubukov and P. Wölfle, Phys. Rev. B **89**, 045108 (2014).
- [17] Z. Dong, A. V. Chubukov, and L. Levitov, Phys. Rev. B **107**, 174512 (2023); Z. Dong, L. Levitov, and A. V. Chubukov, Phys. Rev. B **108**, 134503 (2023).
- [18] P. Wölfle and E. Abrahams, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 041101 (2011).
- [19] D. L. Maslov, P. Sharma, D. Torbunov, and A. V. Chubukov, Phys. Rev. B **96**, 085137 (2017).
- [20] A. V. Chubukov and D. L. Maslov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 216401 (2009); A. V. Chubukov, J. J. Betouras, and D. V. Efremov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 037202 (2014).
- [21] The angular integral also contains the term proportional to $\delta(\omega_q)$, but we can ignore it as we are considering the contribution from $\omega_q \gg \omega_m > 0$.
- [22] J. Rech, C. Pépin, and A. V. Chubukov, Phys. Rev. B **74**, 195126 (2006).