

Effects of forward disorder on quasi-1D superconductors

Giacomo Morpurgo, Thierry Giamarchi

DQMP, University of Geneva, 24 Quai Ernest-Ansermet, CH-1211 Geneva, Switzerland

(Dated: March 20, 2024)

We study the competition between disorder and singlet superconductivity in a quasi-1d system. We investigate the applicability of the Anderson theorem, namely that time-reversal conserving (non-magnetic) disorder does not impact the critical temperature, by opposition to time-reversal breaking disorder (magnetic). To do so we examine a quasi-1d system of spin 1/2 fermions with attractive interactions and forward scattering disorder using field theory (bosonization). By computing the superconducting critical temperature (T_c), we find that for non-magnetic disorder the Anderson theorem also holds in the quasi-1D geometry. On the contrary, magnetic disorder has an impact on the critical temperature, that we investigate by deriving renormalization group (RG) equations describing the competition between the disorder and the interactions. Computing the critical temperature as a function of disorder strength, we see that different regimes arise depending on the strength of interactions. We discuss possible platforms where to observe this in cold atoms and condensed matter.

I. INTRODUCTION

Competition between superconductivity and disorder is a very important and fundamental problem. By nature superconductivity would be naively be expected to be robust to disorder. One important question, addressed from the early days of superconductivity [1, 2] is whether the presence of disorder in the normal phase is able or not to impede the occurrence of the superconducting phase transition or drastically change its critical temperature. The result, known under the name of Anderson's theorem [2] is that for a singlet superconductor obeying the Bardeen-Cooper-Schrieffer (BCS) mechanism non-magnetic impurities have absolutely no effect on the critical temperature, while magnetic impurities do decrease the critical temperature ("destroying" superconductivity). This behaviour was explained very clearly by Anderson by a symmetry argument. As long as the disorder would still respect time-reversal symmetry (as non-magnetic disorder does), one can still form a pair of eigenstates which are the time-reversal partners of each other, instead of the usual k and $-k$ states forming a Cooper pair in the pure system. However, as soon as the disorder breaks time-reversal symmetry (as magnetic disorder does), then there is no way of forming an equivalent of the Cooper pair and superconductivity is destroyed. For magnetic disorder, formulas giving the reduction of T_c with the concentration of disorder were given [1].

This dramatic difference in behaviour does extend to others type and pairing nature of superconductivity, where both kind of disorder can decrease significantly the critical temperature. The robustness of the superconducting transition to disorder has thus been seen as a probe of the nature and pairing symmetry of the superconducting order parameter in materials as varied as heavy fermions [3], organic superconductors [4] and high T_c superconductors [5]. The combined problem of disorder and interactions has also been studied theoretically in different settings including the 3D Hubbard model framework (both repulsive and attractive) to compare the competition between different orders in presence of disorder [6, 7], or 2D superconductors [8, 9].

However the situation was realized to be more compli-

cated than predicted by simple applications of the BCS mean-field equation to disordered systems. This is in particular the case when dimensionality allows the disorder to have a strong effect, such as e.g. leading to Anderson localization [10]. In such cases, since the very nature of the eigenstates is affected by the disorder the symmetry argument does not suffice and even non-magnetic disorder can potentially affect T_c . It was indeed shown to be the case for systems made of coupled 1D chains with attractive interactions. In such a case non-magnetic disorder is able to destroy even s-wave pairing [11], or in some regime even to enhance it [12].

One could of course argue that such results are the direct consequence of the existence of the rather drastic phenomenon of Anderson localization, quite efficient in one dimension, but much more easy to reduce strongly in higher dimensional cases. Even in one dimension since Anderson localization is intimately linked to the presence of backscattering due to disorder [13–15] one could expect to recover an Anderson theorem if such backscattering is suppressed and if only forward scattering exists from the disorder.

Such questions have become timely since recently cold atomic systems have provided excellent experimental realizations in which both disorder and interactions could be controlled [16, 17]. In such systems localization of one particle in quasiperiodic or speckle potentials [18–20], disordered interacting bosons [21, 22] and fermions [23, 24] have been realized. More generally cold atoms have proven to be excellent systems to probe or think of combined effects of interactions and disorder or quasiperiodicity in a large variety of situations [25–27].

In this paper we thus examine the effects of non-magnetic and magnetic disorder on a system made of coupled one dimensional fermionic chains with attractive interactions. To avoid or minimize effects due to Anderson localisation, we restrict ourselves only to long wavelength disorder having Fourier components much smaller than $2k_F$ where k_F is the Fermi wavevector of the chains. In Sec. II, we present the model, the bosonized formalism and the observables that we will look at in order to compute the critical temperature. In Sec. III, we examine non-magnetic disorder, and find that forward non-magnetic disorder has no impact on




FIG. 1. Fermionic tubes of spin 1/2 particles able to tunnel between the tubes. The particles experience a contact attractive interaction U (see text), leading to a singlet superconducting ground state. The tubes can be continuous, or have their own lattice. In which case the model is the attractive Hubbard model with anisotropic hopping t_{\parallel} along the chains and t_{\perp} between chains. We are in a situation where $t_{\perp} \ll t_{\parallel}$. In addition there is along the chains either a random chemical potential μ_i or a random magnetic field h_i^z .

the critical temperature. In Sec. IV, we instead study the case of magnetic disorder. First, we look at the case where we neglect the spin gap in the spin sector of the Hamiltonian, which simplifies the problem and allows us to treat it almost completely analytically. We find that disorder here weakens the superconductivity until it destroys it. Secondly, we treat the case of a finite spin gap. To deal with the corresponding “sine-Gordon” term in the Hamiltonian we use a renormalization group (RG) technique. In this case, while we still find that disorder will ultimately lead to the destruction of superconductivity, we also see that depending on the strength of interaction we get two very distinct regimes due to the competition of the disorder with the spin gap due to the interactions. In Sec. V, we discuss several aspects of our results and also how they could be practically implemented in a cold atom or condensed matter realization. Finally, a conclusion can be found in Sec. VI and more technical details can be found in the appendices.

II. MODEL

A. General microscopic model

We consider a fermionic spin 1/2 model, with attractive contact interaction $U < 0$ made of several 1d tubes arranged in a 3d lattice. The system is schematically shown in Fig. 1. The ground state of the pure system is thus a singlet superconductor with in particular a gap in the spin excitations [28]. The 1d tubes can be continuous or with a lattice, both cases can be treated in a similar way.

We consider two types of disorder. One will be non-magnetic disorder where a random chemical potential couples to the total density

$$\rho_n(x) = c_{\uparrow,n}^{\dagger}(x)c_{\uparrow,n}(x) + c_{\downarrow,n}^{\dagger}(x)c_{\downarrow,n}(x) \quad (1)$$

where $c_{\sigma,n}^{\dagger}(x)$ creates a fermion with spin σ at point x on

chain n . The corresponding disorder term is

$$H_{\text{dis},\rho} = - \sum_n \int dx \mu_n(x) \rho_n(x) \quad (2)$$

The second type is a random magnetic field coupling to the spin density along z

$$\sigma_n^z(x) = c_{\uparrow,n}^{\dagger}(x)c_{\uparrow,n}(x) - c_{\downarrow,n}^{\dagger}(x)c_{\downarrow,n}(x) \quad (3)$$

leading to

$$H_{\text{dis},\sigma} = - \sum_n \int dx h_n^z(x) \sigma_n^z(x) \quad (4)$$

Both the chemical potential $\mu_n(x)$ and random magnetic field $h_n^z(x)$ are taken to be uncorrelated from chain to chain. For the correlation of the disorder along the chains, we wish to avoid the dominant effects of Anderson localization, which is produced by the backscattering on the disorder, and which is anomalously strong in one dimension. As discussed in Ref. 11 and 12 this has a drastic effect even on plain vanilla singlet superconductors. We thus restrict the disorder to have only Fourier components much smaller than $2k_F$ where k_F is Fermi wavevector of one chain. We will discuss the consequences of such a restriction on disorder in more details in Sec. VC but we just note here that such a limitation of the spectrum of disorder is quite natural with speckle disorder [29].

B. Bosonized representation

To deal with the interactions in each chain we use the bosonization technique [28] and introduce collective variables $\phi_{\rho,n}$ (resp. $\phi_{\sigma,n}$) linked to the fluctuations of charge (resp. spin) density on chain n by

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_n(x) &= \frac{-\sqrt{2}}{\pi} \nabla \phi_{\rho,n}(x) \\ \sigma_n^z(x) &= \frac{-\sqrt{2}}{\pi} \nabla \phi_{\sigma,n}(x) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

These variables are conjugate to variables $\theta_{\nu,n}$ (with $\nu = \rho, \sigma$) linked to the phase fluctuations and which obey the canonical commutation relations $[\phi_{\nu,n}(x), \nabla \theta_{\nu}(x', n)] = i\pi \delta(x - x')$

After bosonizing each chain individually, we obtain the following Hamiltonian:

$$H = \sum_n H_{1D,n} + \sum_{\langle n,l \rangle} H_{\perp,nl} \quad (6)$$

where $\langle n, l \rangle$ denotes chains that are nearest neighbors on a

lattice. The Hamiltonian of a single chain is

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{1D,n} = & \frac{1}{2\pi} \int dx \left[\frac{u_\rho}{K_\rho} (\nabla \phi_{\rho,n})^2 + u_\rho K_\rho (\nabla \theta_{\rho,n})^2 \right] \\
& + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int dx \left[\frac{u_\sigma}{K_\sigma} (\nabla \phi_{\sigma,n})^2 + u_\sigma K_\sigma (\nabla \theta_{\sigma,n})^2 \right] \quad (7) \\
& + \frac{2g}{(2\pi\alpha)^2} \int dx \cos(\sqrt{8}\phi_{\sigma,n}) \\
& + H_{\text{dis},n,\rho/\sigma}
\end{aligned}$$

The parameters K_ρ , K_σ , u_ρ and u_σ are the Luttinger parameters and contain the effects of the interactions and the kinetic energy. α is linked to the ultraviolet cut-off of our bosonic theory.

The forward disorder Hamiltonian reads in bosonized form

$$H_{\text{dis},n,\rho} = -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} \int dx \eta_n(x) \nabla \phi_{\rho,n} \quad (8)$$

$$H_{\text{dis},n,\sigma} = -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} \int dx \gamma_{z,n}(x) \nabla \phi_{\sigma,n} \quad (9)$$

where γ_z and η are 2 random gaussian fields with correlations $\overline{\gamma_{z,n}(x)\gamma_{z,m}(x')} = D_{f,e} \delta(x-x') \delta_{n,m}$, $\overline{\eta_n(x)\eta_m(x')} = D_{f,m} \delta(x-x') \delta_{n,m}$ characterizing the forward magnetic and non-magnetic disorders,

Finally we have to consider the interchain coupling. The elementary coupling between the chains should be produced by single particle hopping. We however consider in this paper a different coupling between the chains, namely we retain only the tunnelling of pairs by Josephson coupling. The corresponding part of the Hamiltonian is thus

$$H_{\perp,nl} = -J \int dx \left[c_{\uparrow,n}^\dagger(x) c_{\downarrow,n}^\dagger(x) c_{\downarrow,l}(x) c_{\uparrow,l}(x) \right] \quad (10)$$

where n, l are the 1D chains indexes, and J the Josephson coupling between the chains. We take here J as an independent parameter.

We will come back in Sec. VB on this point. Note that retaining only the Josephson coupling and discarding the single particle tunnelling is usually justified by the presence of a gap in the spin sector for attractive interactions [28]. For large negative U , one has the usual estimate of the Josephson coupling $J = (4t_\perp^2)/|U|$. We will take (10) as the interchain Hamiltonian for our study, while still noting that in the case of a magnetic disorder, which can potentially break the spin gap the situation is more delicate.

The physical properties of the system are thus controlled by the above Hamiltonian and thus depend crucially on the Luttinger liquid parameters. In order to work with a specific example we focus in the following to the parameters corresponding to the case of tubes with a lattice and that realize the fermionic spin-1/2 Hubbard model with the Hamiltonian

$$H = - \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle, \sigma} t_{i,j} c_{i,\sigma}^\dagger c_{j,\sigma} + h.c. + U \sum_i c_{i,\uparrow}^\dagger c_{i,\uparrow} c_{i,\downarrow}^\dagger c_{i,\downarrow} + H_{\text{dis}} \quad (11)$$

where $t_{i,j}$ is the hopping amplitude from site i to site j , $c_{i,\sigma}, c_{i,\sigma}^\dagger$ are the destruction/creation operators at site i and spin σ . U is the on-site interaction. $\langle i, j \rangle$ denotes nearest neighbors on a cubic lattice. By quasi 1d system, we mean that the hopping $t_{i,j}$ is small in all but one direction $t_z = t_y \ll t_x$. H_{dis} encodes the disorder part of the Hamiltonian.

For a clean 1D attractive Hubbard model the spin sector is gapped and the parameters of the charge sector can be computed perturbatively in U [28, 30] and lead to:

$$\begin{aligned}
K_{\rho,\sigma} &= (1 \pm U/(\pi v_F))^{-1/2} \\
u_{\rho,\sigma} &= v_F (1 \pm U/(\pi v_F))^{1/2} \quad (12) \\
g &= U
\end{aligned}$$

where the upper sign is for ρ and v_F is the Fermi velocity $v_F = 2t_\parallel \sin(k_F)$.

C. Observables

Since our main goal is to compute the effect of the disorder on the superconducting critical temperature, a central part of our calculations is the pair correlation function.

We treat the interchain Hamiltonian (10) in mean-field

$$c_{\uparrow,n}^\dagger(x) c_{\downarrow,n}^\dagger = \langle c_{\uparrow,n}^\dagger(x) c_{\downarrow,n}^\dagger \rangle + \delta \left(c_{\uparrow,n}^\dagger(x) c_{\downarrow,n}^\dagger \right) \quad (13)$$

and retain only the terms linear in the fluctuation part around the mean value.

This leads to

$$H_{\perp,MF} = -\frac{2zJ}{\pi\alpha} \Delta \sum_n \cos(\sqrt{2}\theta_{\rho,n}(x)) \cos(\sqrt{2}\phi_{\sigma,n}(x)) \quad (14)$$

where z is the number of neighboring chains and

$$\Delta = \frac{1}{\pi\alpha} \langle e^{i\sqrt{2}\theta_\rho} \cos(\sqrt{2}\phi_\sigma) \rangle \quad (15)$$

Where we will choose the gauge where Δ is real.

The critical temperature is given by the divergence of the pair susceptibility $\chi(T)$, which is given in the mean-field (RPA) approximation by

$$\chi(\beta) = \frac{\chi_0(\beta)}{1 - \frac{2zJ}{(\pi\alpha)^2} \chi_0(\beta)} \quad (16)$$

where $\chi_0(\beta)$ is the uniform and static susceptibility in the absence of interchain coupling at the temperature $T = 1/\beta$. The superconducting critical temperature T_c is thus given by the condition

$$1 = \frac{2zJ}{(\pi\alpha)^2} \chi_0(\beta_c) \quad (17)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\chi_0(\beta) = & \int dx \int_0^\beta d\tau \\
& \langle T_\tau \cos(\sqrt{2}\theta_\rho(x, \tau)) \cos(\sqrt{2}\phi_\sigma(x, \tau)) \\
& \cos(\sqrt{2}\theta_\rho(0, 0)) \cos(\sqrt{2}\phi_\sigma(0, 0)) \rangle_{H_{1D}} \quad (18)
\end{aligned}$$

Since the Hamiltonian (7) is separated between the charge and spin sectors we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_0(\beta) &= \frac{1}{u_\sigma} \int \int_{\Gamma(\beta)} dx d(u_\sigma \tau) \\ &\langle T_\tau \cos(\sqrt{2}\theta_\rho(x, u_\rho \tau)) \cos(\sqrt{2}\theta_\rho(0, 0)) \rangle_{H_\rho} \\ &\cdot \langle T_\tau \cos(\sqrt{2}\phi_\sigma(x, u_\sigma \tau)) \cos(\sqrt{2}\phi_\sigma(0, 0)) \rangle_{H_\sigma} \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where we have used the fact that for distances which are larger than $u_\sigma \beta$, the correlations decay exponentially in 1D, therefore we can neglect this part and integrate on a disk of radius $u_\sigma \beta$ denoted $\Gamma(\beta)$.

Note that this mean-field solution is linked to the quasi-one dimensional nature of the problem and is different from the usual BCS mean-field calculation that was used to establish the Anderson theorem [1, 2]. In the latter case one computes the pair susceptibility with the *full* kinetic energy (thus including the transverse hopping as well) but in an RPA approximation in the *interaction* U . At T_c the gap is thus automatically zero in the BCS approximation. In the quasi-one dimensional situation we consider here the situation is different since even for decoupled chains, for which the T_c is zero even in the absence of disorder, due to the quantum fluctuations, a strong spin gap can exist for the spin sector. We discuss more these differences in the Sec. VA.

III. NON-MAGNETIC DISORDER

Let us first consider the case of non-magnetic disorder. The Hamiltonian to consider at the single chain level, in particular to solve (17) giving T_c , is (7) with the disorder (8).

Since the charge sector part of the Hamiltonian is purely quadratic, the disorder can be absorbed by a simple redefinition of the field $\phi(x)$ [15]

$$\phi_\rho \rightarrow \tilde{\phi}_\rho = \phi_\rho - \frac{\sqrt{2}K_\rho}{u_\rho} \int_0^x dx' \eta(x') \quad (20)$$

This leads to an Hamiltonian for the charge sector of the form:

$$\begin{aligned} H &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int dx \frac{u_\rho}{K_\rho} (\nabla \tilde{\phi}_\rho)^2 + u_\rho K_\rho (\nabla \theta_\rho)^2 \\ &- \frac{K_\rho}{u_\rho \pi} \int dx \eta^2(x) \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Note that this transformation does not affect the field $\theta(x)$ which remains conjugate to the field $\tilde{\phi}(x)$. The calculations of the susceptibility which depends on $\langle T_\tau \cos(\sqrt{2}\theta_\rho(x, u\tau)) \cos(\sqrt{2}\theta_\rho(0, 0)) \rangle_{H_\rho}$ and the spin part which is thus not affected by the disorder either, and gives an identical result with or without forward disorder.

An analogous result than the Anderson theorem, namely that a non-magnetic forward disorder has no impact on the

critical temperature of superconductivity ($T_c(D_{f,e})/T_c(0) = 1$) is recovered. This result can also be viewed directly in the fermion language since the transformation (20) correspond to a redefinition

$$\psi_{R,L}(r) \rightarrow \psi_{R,L} e^{\pm i \frac{K_\rho}{u_\rho} \int_{-\infty}^x dy \eta(y)} \quad (22)$$

where R (resp. L) denotes the right and left movers and in (22) the upper sign refers to R . As for the Anderson theorem one thus see that it is possible to create new objects that are still related by time reversal symmetry, even in the presence of disorder. When pairing these objects the disorder totally disappears, leading to the invariance of the critical temperature. The forward scattering disorder will however still affect other correlations in this model, for example the density-density ones (basically anything which involves the field ϕ_σ).

Note that this result is modified if the backward scattering is present [11]. The Anderson localization that it induces leads to an exponential decay of the pair correlation functions and thus compete with the superconductivity. One can thus expect drastically different effects of non-magnetic disorder on the superconductivity depending on which Fourier components are present. This can in principle be tested by changing k_F with respect to an upper cutoff in the disorder spectrum.

IV. MAGNETIC DISORDER

We now turn to the case of magnetic disorder for which we have to use (7) with the disorder (9). One notes directly two important differences compared to the case of the non-magnetic disorder. First the spin sector of the Hamiltonian (7) is not simply quadratic but has a sine-Gordon form. Thus an analogous transformation to (20) done for the spin sector does not allow to get rid of the magnetic disorder in the Hamiltonian. This traduces the competition between the random magnetic field and the cosine term that is creating the spin gap. A corresponding term would only exist in the charge sector if the system is in a Mott state with a commensurate filling [31, 32].

A second important difference is the fact that the pair susceptibility (19) depends, for the spin sector on the field ϕ_σ . This is in contrast to the charge sector where only the dual field θ_ρ appears. Thus doing the above mentioned transformation does introduce a disorder dependence in the pair susceptibility, and this regardless of the presence of the $\cos(\sqrt{8}\phi_\sigma)$ term in the Hamiltonian. This indicates from the start that the magnetic disorder will have an effect on the correlations and thus on the critical temperature.

In the calculation of the pair susceptibility, the charge sector Hamiltonian is quadratic. The charge part of the correlations is thus [28]

$$\begin{aligned} R_\theta(r) &= \langle T_\tau \cos(\sqrt{2}\theta_\rho(x, u\tau)) \cos(\sqrt{2}\theta_\rho(0, 0)) \rangle_{H_\rho} \\ &\simeq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\alpha}{r} \right)^{-\frac{1}{K_\rho}} \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where r is given by $(x, u_{\rho/\sigma}\tau)$ depending if we are computing correlation functions in the charge sector or spin sector and $r^2 = x^2 + (u_{\rho/\sigma}\tau)^2$.

Due to the sine-Gordon form of the spin part of the Hamiltonian (7) the full calculation of the spin sector is more involved and we analyze it in the next two sections.

A. Spin sector with $g = 0$

Let us start in this section by taking setting $g = 0$ in the Hamiltonian. This amounts to considering a case in which the spin gap that is opened by the presence of the cosine term is so small that it can be neglected. This corresponds typically to the case of attractive interactions very small compared to the kinetic energy in the chain, since in that case it is well known that the spin gap is exponentially small in the ratio $t_{\parallel}/|U|$. This simplified model allows to disentangle the effects produced by the magnetic disorder on the pair in the pair susceptibility, from the robustness of the finite pairing gap.

Note that in our model this does not necessarily mean that T_c itself is small, since T_c is given by equation (17) and χ_o depends mostly on K_ρ and K_σ . Although in this case we can formally take any value for K_σ we restrict ourselves to $K_\sigma = 1$ which corresponds to a spin rotation invariant Hamiltonian with $g \rightarrow 0$ [28]. Our study can be straightforwardly extended to any value of K_σ when $g = 0$.

Note that, as mentioned in the previous section, we still consider, even if we take a zero spin gap, that the interchain coupling is of the Josephson form, with a fixed J . We come back on this approximation in Sec.VB.

The dephasing produced by the disorder (9) can be straightforwardly computed in the case $g = 0$. It affects the spin part of the correlations and thus the T_c . For $g = 0$ one makes the change of variables similar to the one performed in the charge sector:

$$\phi_\sigma \rightarrow \tilde{\phi}_\sigma = \phi_\sigma - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{u_\sigma} \int_0^x dx' \gamma_z(x') \quad (24)$$

which removes the disorder from the Hamiltonian. Contrarily to the case of non-magnetic disorder the change of variables (24) modifies the susceptibility (19). These correlations become, after performing the ensemble averaging over disorder

$$\begin{aligned} \langle T_\tau \cos(\sqrt{2}\phi_\sigma(x, u\tau)) \cos(\sqrt{2}\phi_\sigma(0, 0)) \rangle_{H_\sigma} \\ \simeq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\alpha}{r} \right) e^{-\frac{2D_{f,m}}{u_\sigma^2}|x|} \quad (25) \end{aligned}$$

The forward magnetic disorder leads thus to an exponential decay of the spin part of the correlation function with a characteristic lengthscale related to the disorder strength. One can thus expect a strong impact of magnetic impurities on T_c and roughly a suppression of the superconducting critical temperature when the thermal length associated with the temperature T_c becomes larger than the length associated with the disorder.

More quantitatively, to determine T_c we solve (17)

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \frac{2zJ}{(\pi\alpha)^2} \int dx \int_0^{\beta_c} d\tau \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{\alpha}{r} \right)^{-\frac{1}{k_\rho}+1} e^{-\frac{2D_{f,m}}{u_\sigma^2}|x|} \\ &= \frac{zJ}{u_\sigma(2\pi\alpha)^2} \alpha^{1-\frac{1}{k_\rho}} \int_\alpha^{u/T_c} dr r^{-\frac{1}{k_\rho}} 2\pi F\left(\frac{2D_{f,m}}{u_\sigma^2}r\right) \quad (26) \end{aligned}$$

where $F(x) = (I_o(x) - L_o(x))$ and I_o (resp. L_o) is a modified Bessel function of the 1st kind (resp. a modified Struve function). For simplicity we have assumed in the above formula that the charge velocity u_ρ and the spin one u_σ are identical so we can use the same r for the spin and charge sector. These two velocities are in general different [28]. The generalization of (26) to the case of two different velocities is straightforward but doesn't change fundamentally the results at the cost of not having analytically closed expressions. We discuss it in the Appendix C.

Note that to compute numerically the integrals (26), one has to be especially cautious. Indeed, while the difference of Bessel and Struve functions is well behaved, these two functions diverge exponentially individually. One has to implement a series expansion of the difference at large argument to be able to compute the integrals. To have a good numerical convergence we did first the integral on r and only in a second time the integral on the angle θ , using polar coordinates for (26).

Note also that although the disorder leads to an exponential decay in space, the fact that the disorder itself is time independent and thus preserves a good coherence in time, leads ultimately after integration over the polar angle to a power-law decay of the correlation at large distance $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} F(x) = \frac{2}{\pi x}$. The decay induced by the disorder is thus less dramatic than could have been expected.

To understand the results, let us introduce several characteristic lengths. On one hand $\xi_D = \frac{u_\sigma^2}{2D_{f,m}}$ is the disorder length, which controls the exponential decay rate in (25). On the other hand, $\xi_J = \frac{v_F}{T_c(0)}$ is a length associated to the superconducting state in the absence of disorder. We also define D_c as the critical disorder, the amount of disorder where there is no finite T_c associated to superconducting phase transition.

Fig. 2 shows the ratio $T_c/T_c(0)$, the critical temperature normalized by the one without disorder, as a function of ξ_J/ξ_D for different values of the attractive interaction U , showing the destruction of the superconductive state by the magnetic disorder. The curves depend on the interaction, the more attractive cases being slightly more robust to disorder. The insert shows the same effect as a function of D/D_c . While the curve don't collapse perfectly on each other, they show an excellent scaling in these variables.

The limit of $g = 0$ is thus a simple limit showing clearly the analogy for the quasi-1D situation of the Anderson theorem. Although the non-magnetic (forward) disorder completely disappears from T_c the magnetic one (time reversal breaking) impacts the critical temperature. Note that these effects are not connected to the existence of Anderson localization since they are produced by forward scattering on the




FIG. 2. $T_c/T_c(0)$ as a function of the ratio of characteristic lengths for different interactions U . The insets shows the same quantity as a function of the disorder normalized by the critical value of the disorder D_c at which superconductivity is destroyed.

disorder.

B. The general case $g \neq 0$

For the anisotropic case that we consider here, the calculation of the previous section is in fact overestimating the effects of the magnetic disorder, because the full Hamiltonian with a *finite* attractive interaction creates a spin gap via the $\cos(\sqrt{8}\phi_\sigma)$ term. Such a spin gap that locks the particles in singlet states prevents the magnetic field to act. Note that in the quasi-1D geometry that we consider here the critical temperature is controlled by the interchain Josephson coupling, while the spin gap is essentially dependent on the ratio $t_{\parallel}/|U|$. It is thus perfectly possible to have a large spin gap and a small T_c , contrarily to what happens if one computes the T_c in the BCS approximation for which close to T_c the spin gap is essentially zero. This situation is very similar to the case of the attractive higher dimensional Hubbard model for which a large regime of pseudo gap can exist above T_c when $|U|$ is large.

Determining the effect on T_c is more involved in the case $g \neq 0$. We describe in this section a renormalization group method allowing the calculation of the correlations in the spin sector.

To renormalize the susceptibility χ_o we follow a similar procedure than the one used in [33]. The correlation function R_σ is given for $g = 0$ by

$$R_\sigma(r) = \frac{1}{2} e^{-\frac{K_\sigma}{2} \ln\left(\frac{x^2 + (u_\sigma|\tau| + \alpha)^2}{\alpha^2}\right)} e^{-\frac{2K_\sigma^2 D_{f,m}}{u_\sigma^2} |x|} \quad (27)$$

For $r \gg \alpha$, we have $x^2 + (u_\sigma|\tau| + \alpha)^2 \approx r^2$. We consider the function

$$H_\sigma(r) = R_\sigma(r) e^{\frac{2K_\sigma^2 D_{f,m}}{u_\sigma^2} |x|} e^{\frac{K_\sigma}{2} \ln\left(\frac{x^2 + (u_\sigma|\tau| + \alpha)^2}{\alpha^2}\right)} \quad (28)$$

with $g = 0$, $H_\sigma = 1/2$. For $g \neq 0$, we renormalize the cutoff α until it reaches r in the perturbative expansion of (28) in

powers of g . This multiplicative renormalization procedure allows to define a function $I_\sigma(dl, g(l))$ such that

$$H_\sigma(r, \alpha_o, g(\alpha_o)) = e^{\int_0^{\ln(r/\alpha)} \ln(I(dl, g(l)))} \quad (29)$$

1. RG flow

The algebra can be found in Appendix A.

The renormalization equations for the parameters K_σ , g , $D_{f,m}$ and for the susceptibility χ_o read:

$$\frac{dK_\sigma}{dl} = -\frac{g^2 K_\sigma^2}{2\pi^2 u_\sigma^2} F\left(\frac{8D_{f,m} K_\sigma^2 \alpha_o}{u_\sigma^2} e^l\right) \quad (30)$$

$$\frac{dg}{dl} = (2 - 2K_\sigma)g \quad (31)$$

$$\frac{dD_{f,m}}{dl} = -\frac{g^2 K_\sigma D_{f,m}}{\pi^3 u_\sigma^2} G\left(\frac{8D_{f,m} K_\sigma^2 \alpha_o}{u_\sigma^2} e^l\right) \quad (32)$$

$$F(x) = (I_0(x) - L_0(x)) \quad (33)$$

$$G(x) = -\frac{2}{3}x + \pi \frac{I_1(x) - L_1(x)}{x} + \pi (I_2(x) - L_2(x)) \quad (34)$$

where I_o, I_1 and I_2 are modified Bessel functions of the 1st kind, and L_o, L_1 and L_2 are modified Struve functions.

Note that for simplicity we neglect the renormalization of the u_σ parameter in our calculation, indeed we don't expect the renormalization of the speeds to be large and we also don't expect it to lead to new physical phenomena.

In the limit of no-disorder $D_{f,m} \rightarrow 0$, we recover the usual RG equations for K_σ, g because $F(0) = 1$. We directly see here that the disorder and the g term are competing against each other. Indeed, the g term controls the decrease of the disorder (32). On the other hand, the effect of the disorder on g is more subtle. The RG equation for g (31) depends only on K_σ , whereas if K_σ is smaller than 1, g is relevant and irrelevant otherwise. However, the disorder acts on the RG equation for K_σ (30) and slows down its decrease! ($F(x)$ is always smaller than 1) It therefore opposes itself indirectly to the parameter reaching a regime where g would be relevant (or at least slow down the g divergence if g is relevant). More details on the interpretation of the RG equations are given in the appendix B.

Fig. 3.a shows the RG flow in the $D_{f,m}\alpha - g$ plane. We separate it in two zones, delimited by a separatrix (red line), defined by which one of those quantities (in absolute values) reaches first 1.

Below the separatrix, as can be seen in Fig. 3.c, the term in g diverges first. This can be interpreted as the fact that the system succeeds in having a spin gap due to the attractive interaction, the disorder being too weak to destroy this gap. Furthermore, in this regime the disorder is suppressed by the interaction and $D_{f,m}$ goes towards 0 (and $D_{f,m}\alpha$ doesn't diverge). The same is true for K_σ , which goes also towards 0. Since the RG equations are derived perturbatively in g , and similarly to what is done for the case of the simple sine-Gordon flow [28] we stop the flow at $g = 1$, beyond which the RG becomes unreliable.




FIG. 3. **a)** RG flow of our model, in red, the separatrix between the two different regions (disorder dominating vs g dominating); **b)** Example of the flow for parameters for which the disorder dominates; **c)** Example of the flow in the g dominated regime.

On the other hand, if we are above the separatrix, the disorder wins and manages to destroy the spin gap. Both $D_{f,m}$ and K_{σ} go to constants. Even if g diverges, it has now no effect on the other parameters of the flow. This regime becomes similar to the study of the previous section Sec. IV A where there was no g term and thus no gap.

2. Correlation functions

We compute using the same renormalization procedure, the correlation function $R_{\sigma}(r)$. This correlation is given by:

$$R_{\sigma}(r) = \frac{1}{2} e^{-K_{\sigma} \ln(r/\alpha)} e^{-\frac{2K_{\sigma}^2 D_{f,m}}{u_{\sigma}^2} |x|} e^{-\int_0^{\ln(r/\alpha)} \frac{g(l) dl}{\pi u_{\sigma}}} \cdot e^{\int_0^{\ln(r/\alpha)} dl \left[\frac{K_{\sigma}^2(l) g^2(l)}{2\pi^2 u_{\sigma}^2} \ln(r) F(A(l)) + \frac{4g^2(l) D_{f,m}(l) K_{\sigma}^3(l)}{\pi^3 u_{\sigma}^4} |x| G(A(l)) \right]}$$

$$A(l) = \frac{8D_{f,m}(l) K_{\sigma}^2(l)}{u_{\sigma}^2} \alpha(l) \quad (35)$$

If g dominates, we have to stop the RG flow when g gets of order 1. Beyond this point, all the correlations related to the spin degree of freedom are frozen to a constant. So our correlation function starts as a power law like function whose exponent is renormalized as we go to larger scales, until the correlation freezes to a constant.

If the disorder dominates, we do not stop the RG flow, since the diverging g has no effect anymore on the correlation function and the other parameters. Neglecting g is fully justified beyond the point for which $D_{f,m} \alpha \sim O(1)$. Note however that there is an intermediate regime, due to the term linear in g in the renormalization of $R_{\sigma}(r)$ that is difficult to control perturbatively, since the renormalized g is large, but the exponential decay that sets in when $D_{f,m} \alpha \sim O(1)$ has not yet started. This case is similar to the perturbative treatment of the commensurate-incommensurate phase transition [34], and ultimately does not affect the physics of the problem. In this regime we




FIG. 4. The black line is the separatrix between the 2 RG flow regions, where either the interactions or the disorder are dominating. The red points correspond to the critical disorder for a given $U/(g)$, separating the region where there is superconductivity from the one where there is no superconductivity.

thus qualitatively have a correlation function which start as power law, get corrected a bit (until g stops “resisting” to the disorder) and finally decays exponentially, similarly to its behavior in the model without g .

3. Critical disorder

The calculation of the correlation function allows us to determine D_{fc} the critical disorder at which the superconductivity is killed. In order to practically evaluate it, we take in this section the definition that when $T_{min} = 10^{-8}$ in units of α_o/u_{σ} we can consider that this is equivalent to having completely killed the superconductivity. Furthermore, in this case, given the sudden changes in the values of $\chi_o(0,0)$ as we pass from one regime to the other with large interactions, the best that we can numerically do is approach D_{fc} from below.

On Figure 4, we compare the separatrix of our RG flow to the critical disorder for different interactions U . While for small interactions, there is a region where the system is superconducting even if the disorder dominates the RG flow, at large interactions the critical disorder coincide with the separatrix/ the change of regimes. This can be interpreted by the fact that when the spin gap is very small the competition between the disorder and the superconductivity is dominated by the competition between the random magnetic field that acts as a random chemical potential for each spin species separately and the Josephson term that favors a $q = 0$ like pairing in a singlet state. When the gap is large the random magnetic field has first to destroy the gap to be efficient but then wins very efficiently against the (small) Josephson coupling term.

4. Critical temperature

The susceptibility of one chain $\chi_o(q=0, \omega=0)$ is given by:

$$\chi_o(0,0) = \int dx \int_0^{\beta_c} d\tau R_\rho(r)R_\sigma(r) \quad (36)$$

where $r^2 = x^2 + (u_\sigma \tau)^2$ and we neglect the factors of α inside r . We use polar coordinates with $u_\sigma \tau = y$. This leads to:

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_o(0,0) = & \frac{1}{4u_\sigma} \int_{\alpha_o}^{u\beta_c} dr r^{(1-K_\sigma - \frac{1}{k_\rho})} e^{-\int_0^{\ln(r/\alpha_o)} \frac{g(l)dl}{\pi u_\sigma}} \\ & \cdot e^{\int_0^{\ln(r/\alpha_o)} dl \frac{K_\sigma^2(l)g^2(l)}{2\pi^2 u_\sigma^2} \ln(r)F(A(l))} \\ & \cdot \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta e^{-\left(\frac{2K_\sigma^2 D_{f,m}}{u_\sigma^2} - \int_0^{\ln(r/\alpha_o)} dl \frac{4g^2(l)D_{f,m}(l)K_\sigma^3(l)}{\pi^3 u_\sigma^4} G(A(l))\right)|x|} \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

After integrating over the angles, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_o(0,0) = & \frac{1}{4u_\sigma} \int_{\alpha_o}^{u\beta_c} dr r^{1-K_\sigma - \frac{1}{k_\rho}} \\ & \cdot e^{\int_0^{\ln(r/\alpha_o)} dl \left(-\frac{g(l)}{\pi u_\sigma} + \frac{K_\sigma^2(l)g^2(l)}{2\pi^2 u_\sigma^2} \ln(r)F(A(l))\right)} \\ & \cdot 2\pi F \left[\left(\frac{2K_\sigma^2 D_{f,m}}{u_\sigma^2} - \int_0^{\ln(r/\alpha_o)} dl \frac{4g^2(l)D_{f,m}(l)K_\sigma^3(l)}{\pi^3 u_\sigma^4} G(A(l)) \right) r \right] \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Where the parameters $K_\sigma, D_{f,m}$ outside of the integrals over l are the parameters at the beginning of the RG procedure. This expression is similar to the one for the $g=0$ model with the main differences of the appearance of a linear term in g due to the precise correlation function we are looking at and the fact that the parameters $K_\sigma, D_{f,m}$ are here renormalized by the RG flow.

The behaviour of $\chi_o(0,0)$ is different depending at which scale and in which regime (interaction or disorder dominated) we are looking. At short scales, in both cases, the integrand of (38) is proportional to the power law $r^{1-\frac{1}{k_\rho}-K_\sigma}$, since $F(r)$ goes to 1 for small r . At large r , $\chi_o(0,0)$ has a different behaviour depending of which parameter dominates. If g dominates, since $R_\sigma(r)$ is now a constant, the integrand of (38) becomes proportional to $r^{1-\frac{1}{k_\rho}}$, and this power law is always growing with r . There is therefore always a finite critical temperature in this regime. On the other hand, if the disorder dominates, the integrand of (38) behaves as $r^{-\frac{1}{k_\rho}-K_\sigma}$, which decays fast enough to ensure convergence for the interactions that we are considering. This implies that there will not always be a finite T_c in this regime. This sudden change in behaviour has an impact on the critical temperature. One should note that this abrupt change of behaviour is at least partly due from our treatment in the RG procedure of the two regimes above and below the separatrix




FIG. 5. T_c normalized as a function of the strength of magnetic forward disorder normalized over the critical disorder for different values of U .

as two completely different regimes. This allows for a simple estimation of the complicated integral while retaining the main features of the solution. A more complete treatment would smoothen the curve.

Finally, we compute the critical temperature by solving (17). Fig. 5 shows two different regimes in the critical temperature. To compute numerically those integrals, it is useful to apply different treatments depending on the RG regime. Contrarily to the case $g=0$ here it is better to perform first the integration over the angles θ and then integrate on r . For small enough interactions, we recover a very similar behavior than for the $g=0$ case, while for large interactions, the decrease of T_c is dramatically slowed by the presence of the finite gap and then T_c drops very fast to zero, as explained qualitatively above.

Fig. 6 plots the same quantity but as a function of the ratio of the two characteristic lengthscales ξ_J which characterize the superconducting phase in the pure case and ξ_D which is the lengthscale of the exponential decay for the disordered case. As can be seen in the figure, when the gap is small (small U) the superconductivity is killed when these two lengths are essentially crossing each other and their ratio is about one. On the contrary when the interactions are large and there is a well formed spin gap, it is necessary first for the disorder to fight the spin gap, and this independently of the scale ξ_J which characterize the *transverse* coupling. This leads to the slow and somewhat linear decrease of T_c . Once the gap is gone the disorder is at that point large enough that it overcomes also essentially the contribution coming from the *transverse* Josephson coupling.

V. DISCUSSION

A. Comparison with the isotropic BCS solution

We see from the previous section that we obtain, for the quasi-1D situation the equivalent of an Anderson theorem,




FIG. 6. T_c as a function of the strength of magnetic forward disorder for different values of U . The lengths ξ_J (resp. ξ_D) characterize the superconducting order coming from the *transverse coupling* J (resp. the exponential decay due to disorder). This allows to distinguish two regimes depending on whether the spin gap of an *isolated* chain is large or small.

originally derived close to the T_c in an isotropic situation with a solution of the BCS equations. A weak random chemical potential does not affect T_c or the pairing correlation functions below T_c . A disorder breaking the time-reversal symmetry such as a random magnetic disorder has a more subtle complicated effect. In essence such a disorder appears in the pair correlation functions and thus will have an effect on the superconductivity as indicated in Fig. 5 and Fig. 6.

We look however at a situation for which the T_c and pairing is essentially controlled by the strength of the interchain (Josephson) coupling, the interactions inside a chain being essentially arbitrary. It is thus perfectly possible to have a quite strong spin gap Δ_σ while at the same time having a small T_c . In that case as shown in Fig. 6 the magnetic disorder needs first to destroy the spin gap before being able to influence T_c or the pair correlations. For an isotropic case, such a situation would also occur on a lattice, with e.g. an attractive Hubbard model at large $|U|$, since in such a situation the spin gap scale is essentially $|U|$ while at the same time the kinetic energy of the pairs becomes $4t^2/|U|$ leading to a small condensation temperature and thus to a small T_c . It would be interesting to study the effect of magnetic disorder in such a system to see if similar effects than the ones observed here would be found.

B. Interchain hopping and Josephson coupling

In the model we considered in the previous sections, we have assumed that the chains were coupled by a Josephson coupling allowing for the hopping of singlet pairs across the chains. As discussed in Sec. II B most of the microscopic realizations contains in fact a single particle hopping between the chains. In presence of a spin gap, due to the attractive interaction, the single particle hopping is killed and replaced by the Josephson coupling we have considered in this paper.

For the non-magnetic disorder keeping only the Josephson coupling poses no problem, since the spin gap is preserved by the disorder. The results that we derived in the previous section are thus directly applicable to systems with single particle hopping, and we do not expect any important difference between the two models.

For the magnetic disorder on the contrary, the spin gap is first destroyed by the disorder and it is thus a challenging and important question to know how the results we have obtained would apply when the systems has single particle hopping to start with. A detailed solution, in particular by renormalization techniques that have been used to tackle the competition between the single particle hopping and the particle-particle or particle-hole hopping [28] is clearly beyond the scope of the present paper and will be left for a future publication.

One can however expect the general results that we have derived here with the Josephson coupling to be largely valid. Indeed the main additional effect for magnetic disorder will be the destruction of the Josephson coupling leading to singlet pair hopping. This should naively make the destruction of the singlet superconductivity even more efficient than for a model in which the Josephson coupling is kept constant. We can thus expect naively an even stronger effect of the magnetic disorder, making the contrast between the magnetic and non-magnetic disorder even more marked.

An interesting possibility for the case of single particle hopping will be the possibility to stabilize other phases in presence of the magnetic disorder. One order parameter that would be robust to the magnetic disorder is

$$O_{TS,xy}(r) \sim e^{i\sqrt{2}\theta_\rho(r)} \cos(\sqrt{2}\theta_\sigma(r)) \quad (39)$$

or the equivalent one with a sine. This order parameter corresponds to the x or y component of a triplet order parameter. A corresponding pair-hopping term is also generated by the single particle hopping but is, for an attractive interaction, subdominant. Indeed since the field ϕ_σ orders the correlations of the field θ_σ decrease exponentially fast. However in presence of the magnetic disorder the $\cos(\sqrt{8}\phi_\sigma)$ term in the single chain Hamiltonian (7) is essentially killed and the θ_σ are the only correlations without exponential decay. Since $K_\rho > 1$ because of the attractive interaction, the θ_ρ correlations are favored in the charge sector.

This would lead to the interesting possibility of replacing the singlet superconducting phase by a triplet one when the magnetic disorder becomes large enough. Of course this phase will have a lower T_c but should survive even at relatively large magnetic disorder. This could be a practical possibility to stabilize a triplet superconducting phase even in the presence of contact attractive interaction, e.g. in a cold atom realization.

C. Possible implementations

To test for the the effects investigated here, cold atomic systems provide a natural potential realization. Several key

ingredients that are needed could be realized in such systems. The coupled 1D structures of fermions with attractive interactions can be readily realized, either in systems made of several tubes [35] or in systems with quantum microscopes [36, 37].

One of the required key ingredients is a disorder that would be mainly forward. This also can be realized either with the natural limitation that is provided by a speckle disorder [29] or in systems such as quantum microscopes by generating the disorder via DMD and tuning the Fourier transform of the disorder so that Fourier components close to $2k_F$ are absent.

Measuring T_C itself is not particularly easy but a simpler measurement could be provided by the decay of the pair correlation functions along the tubes, which are a direct measure of the existence of superconductivity in the system. In that respect, for quantum microscopes, since the easily measured quantity is the density, it could be useful to make use of the relation that exists between the attractive and repulsive Hubbard models [38]. Such a transformation maps the attractive model into the repulsive one and the random chemical potential into a random magnetic field and vice versa. The observables are directly related by a particle-hole transformation on spin down only [38]. In particular a singlet order parameter would map onto an antiferromagnetic spin order along the x or y direction.

In the language of the repulsive Hubbard model, one would thus conclude – from the results of the previous sections that a *random magnetic field along z* would essentially not affect the correlation function of the antiferromagnetic fluctuations along x or y of a half filled system (one particle per site) leading to a T_C for antiferromagnetic order in the plane that is essentially unchanged. This corresponds to the Anderson theorem for the non-magnetic disorder. On the other hand putting a random chemical potential along the tubes would drastically destroy such correlation corresponding to the destructive effects of the *magnetic* disorder on single superconductivity that we have found in the present study. The competition that we discussed before between the magnetic disorder and the spin gap in the attractive side becomes the competition between the Mott gap and the random chemical potential on the repulsive side. It is necessary for the random chemical potential to be stronger than the Mott gap to locally dope the system. Once this is reached however the *spin-spin* correlation in the $x - y$ plane get very rapidly destroyed.

In condensed matter systems, one would have to use highly anisotropic systems, organic superconductors are a good candidate [4], and there may also be a possibility of investigation in some 2D systems where high anisotropy has been reported, for example CrSBr [39]. The easy part here is identifying superconductivity since a simple resistance measurement (and Meissner effect) are routine experiments. However, the hard part in this kind of experiments would be to be able to control the disorder in a way that keep the backscattering much smaller than the forward scattering along the chains. One possibility would be, like for two dimensional semiconducting systems to have the impurities

placed far from the conducting chains. This however would have the drawback to also lead to quite correlated potentials from one chain to the next.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this work, we extended the Anderson theorem for superconductivity, stating that non-magnetic impurities do not impact a BCS superconductor, meaning that they do not change its critical temperature, while magnetic impurities would have a drastic effect. We considered a quasi-1d system with forward scattering disorder, coupled by a Josephson coupling favoring singlet superconductivity. We showed that for such a system the non-magnetic forward disorder leaves the T_C and pair correlations essentially unchanged. Magnetic disorder on the other hand has a deep impact on the system. Once such disorder can overcome the spin-gap it starts destroying the pair correlations and hence the superconductivity very efficiently. Quite interestingly the correlation function that seems to survive the magnetic disorder and be still slowly decaying is xy part of the triplet superconducting correlation (with a random magnetic field along z).

We discussed also various possible tests of these predictions in condensed matter and especially in cold atomic gases. Quantum microscopes provide an ideal system to test for the predictions of this paper, using an implementation for a *repulsive* Hubbard model with one particle per site. In that case magnetic disorder would leave the xy antiferromagnetic spin-spin correlations essentially unchanged, while a *non-magnetic* disorder would rapidly destroy such correlations once it is able to suppress the Mott gap.

Several extensions of our work would be interesting. In particular since chains are coupled by single-particle tunnelling and not just by the pair tunnelling, other pair coupling can be generated. This poses to the question of which instability could be dominant once the singlet superconductivity has been destroyed. The most likely candidate is a triplet superconducting pairing. Whether such pairing, which dominates for a single chain, could be effectively stabilizes in the 2D or 3D case is an interesting question and challenge. Indeed if this is the case, it would provide a route to realize triplet superconducting phases with purely contact interactions. These questions will be examined in future studies.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are thankful to Christophe Berthod for his help in the numerical solution of our equations and for very useful discussions. This research was supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation under grants 200020-188687 and 200020-219400.

Appendix A: Computing the RG equations

In this appendix, we describe with more details how to compute $H_\sigma(r_a)$ and how we derive from it our RG equations (30, 31, 32, 35).

We start from :

$$H_\sigma(r_a) = \frac{1}{Z_{\phi_\sigma}} e^{\frac{2K_\sigma^2 D_{f,m} |x_a|}{u_\sigma^2}} e^{\frac{K_\sigma}{2} \ln\left(\frac{x_a^2 + (u_\sigma |\tau_a| + \alpha)^2}{\alpha^2}\right)} \int D\phi_\sigma \sum_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 = \pm 1} \frac{1}{4} e^{i\varepsilon_1 \sqrt{2} \phi_\sigma(r_a)} e^{i\varepsilon_2 \sqrt{2} \phi_\sigma(0)} e^{-S_{\phi_\sigma}} \quad (\text{A1})$$

where S_{ϕ_σ} is the full 1d action of the spin sector after integration of the θ degrees of freedom, and Z_{ϕ_σ} is the partition function associated to it. We first absorb the disorder terms of the Hamiltonian in the definition of the field ϕ_σ and replace them by $\tilde{\phi}_\sigma$ (see also the main text). We then expand the action to the 2nd order in g . For simplicity of notation, we will drop in the equations that follow the σ of ϕ_σ and the m of $D_{f,m}$.

After that, performing the integration over the configurations leads us to have the following expansion in powers of g :

$$H_\sigma(r_a) = e^{\frac{2K_\sigma^2 D_f |x_a|}{u_\sigma^2}} e^{\frac{K_\sigma}{2} \ln\left(\frac{x_a^2 + (u_\sigma |\tau_a| + \alpha)^2}{\alpha^2}\right)} \cdot \left[\sum_{\varepsilon = \pm 1} \frac{1}{4} e^{-i\varepsilon \frac{2K_\sigma}{u_\sigma} \int_0^{x_a} \gamma(x') dx'} \langle e^{i\varepsilon \sqrt{2}(\tilde{\phi}(r_a) - \tilde{\phi}(0))} \rangle_{H_{0\tilde{\phi}}} \right. \\ - \frac{g}{8\pi^2 \alpha^2} \int dx d\tau \sum_\varepsilon e^{-i\varepsilon \frac{2K_\sigma}{u_\sigma} \left(\int_x^{x_a} + \int_x^0 \right) \gamma(x') dx'} \langle e^{i\varepsilon \sqrt{2}(\tilde{\phi}(r_a) + \tilde{\phi}(0)) - 2\tilde{\phi}(x)} \rangle_{H_{0\tilde{\phi}}} \\ + \frac{1}{16} \frac{g^2}{8\pi^4 \alpha^4} \int dx_1 d\tau_1 dx_2 d\tau_2 \sum_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2} e^{-i \frac{2K_\sigma}{u_\sigma} (\varepsilon_1 \int_0^{x_a} + 2\varepsilon_2 \int_{x_2}^{x_1}) \gamma(x') dx'} \langle e^{i\varepsilon_1 \sqrt{2}(\tilde{\phi}(r_a) - \tilde{\phi}(0))} e^{i\varepsilon_2 \sqrt{8}(\tilde{\phi}(x_1) - \tilde{\phi}(x_2))} \rangle_{H_{0\tilde{\phi}}} \\ \left. - \frac{1}{16} \frac{g^2}{8\pi^4 \alpha^4} \int dx_1 d\tau_1 dx_2 d\tau_2 \sum_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2} e^{-i \frac{2K_\sigma}{u_\sigma} (\varepsilon_1 \int_0^{x_a} + 2\varepsilon_2 \int_{x_2}^{x_1}) \gamma(x') dx'} \langle e^{i\varepsilon_1 \sqrt{2}(\tilde{\phi}(r_a) - \tilde{\phi}(0))} \rangle_{H_{0\tilde{\phi}}} \langle e^{i\varepsilon_2 \sqrt{8}(\tilde{\phi}(x_1) - \tilde{\phi}(x_2))} \rangle_{H_{0\tilde{\phi}}} \right]$$

The average on $H_{0\tilde{\phi}}$ is an average on the quadratic part of the Hamiltonian expressed in terms of $\tilde{\phi}$.

1. Disorder averages

To perform the disorder averages in the above expression, we rewrite the integrals with the help of the heaviside function. Completing the square and simplifying the result leads for the first disorder average to:

$$\frac{1}{Z_D} \int d\gamma e^{-\frac{1}{2D_f} \int dx' \gamma(x')^2 - i \frac{2K_\sigma \varepsilon}{u_\sigma} \int_0^{x_a} \gamma(x') dx'} = e^{-\frac{2D_f K_\sigma^2}{u_\sigma^2} |x_a|}$$

where $Z_D = \int d\gamma e^{-\frac{1}{2D_f} \int dx' \gamma(x')^2}$.

The second disorder average (linear term in g) leads in the same way to:

$$e^{\frac{2K_\sigma^2 D_f}{u_\sigma^2} [|x_a - x| + |x|]} e^{-2[\min(x_a, 0 - x)]\theta(-x)\theta(x_a - x) + [x - \max(0, x_a)]\theta(x)\theta(x - x_a)} \quad (\text{A2})$$

For the third term (second order in g), we obtain:

$$e^{\frac{-2K_\sigma^2 D_f}{u_\sigma^2} |x_a| - \frac{8K_\sigma^2 D_f}{u_\sigma^2} |x_1 - x_2|} \cdot e^{-\varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 \frac{8D_f K_\sigma^2}{u_\sigma^2} (\min(x_1, x_a) - \max(0, x_2))\theta(x_a)\theta(x_1)\theta(\min(x_1, x_a) - x_2)} \\ \cdot e^{-\varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 \frac{8D_f K_\sigma^2}{u_\sigma^2} (\min(0, x_2) - \max(x_1, x_a))\theta(-x_a)\theta(-x_1)\theta(x_2 - \max(x_1, x_a))} \\ \cdot e^{\varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 \frac{8D_f K_\sigma^2}{u_\sigma^2} (\min(x_2, x_a) - \max(0, x_1))\theta(x_a)\theta(x_2)\theta(\min(x_2, x_a) - x_1)} \\ \cdot e^{\varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 \frac{8D_f K_\sigma^2}{u_\sigma^2} (\min(0, x_1) - \max(x_2, x_a))\theta(-x_a)\theta(-x_2)\theta(x_1 - \max(x_2, x_a))} \quad (\text{A3})$$

2. Further algebra and some tricks

The remaining configuration averages can be trivially done since $H_{0\tilde{\phi}}$ is quadratic. We use in that case the fact that $\langle e^A \rangle = e^{\frac{1}{2} \langle A^2 \rangle}$ and the following relation [28]

$$\langle (\phi(r_1) - \phi(r_2))^2 \rangle = \frac{K_\sigma}{2} \ln \left[\frac{x^2 + (u_\sigma \tau + \alpha)^2}{\alpha^2} \right] = K_\sigma F_1(r_1 - r_2) \quad (\text{A4})$$

We can then combine the connected and disconnected terms of the second order expansion since they are similar in all of

their terms expect for the cross terms between $(0, x_a)$ and (x_1, x_2) which appear only in the connected term. This leads

to a term of the form:

$$\dots \left[e^{2\varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 K_\sigma (F_1(r_a - r_1) - F_1(r_a - r_2) - F_1(0 - r_1) + F_1(0 - r_2))} - 1 \right] \quad (\text{A5})$$

From (A3) we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{-\frac{2K_\sigma^2 D_f}{u_\sigma^2} |x_a| - \frac{8K_\sigma^2 D_f}{u_\sigma^2} |x_1 - x_2|} \\ & \left[\left(e^{-\varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 \frac{8D_f K_\sigma^2}{u_\sigma^2} (\min(x_1, x_a) - \max(0, x_2)) \theta(x_a) \theta(x_1) \theta(\min(x_1, x_a) - x_2)} e^{-\varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 \frac{8D_f K_\sigma^2}{u_\sigma^2} (\min(0, x_2) - \max(x_1, x_a)) \theta(-x_a) \theta(-x_1) \theta(x_2 - \max(x_1, x_a))} \right. \right. \\ & \cdot e^{\varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 \frac{8D_f K_\sigma^2}{u_\sigma^2} (\min(x_2, x_a) - \max(0, x_1)) \theta(x_a) \theta(x_2) \theta(\min(x_2, x_a) - x_1)} e^{\varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 \frac{8D_f K_\sigma^2}{u_\sigma^2} (\min(0, x_1) - \max(x_2, x_a)) \theta(-x_a) \theta(-x_2) \theta(x_1 - \max(x_2, x_a))} \left. - 1 \right) + 1 \left. \right] \quad (\text{A6}) \end{aligned}$$

which allows us to obtain the renormalization equations for the interaction terms and for the disorder separately.

3. The interaction renormalization equations

We apply the procedure described in [28] to the second term of (A6) multiplied by (A5). In this part of our equations, no disorder (D_f) appears. Rewriting r_1 and r_2 as center of mass ($R = (X = (x_1 + x_2)/2, Y = u_\sigma(\tau_1 + \tau_2)/2)$) and relative coordinates r , we recognize gradients of F_1 : ($\nabla_R F_1(r_a - R)$). In the expansion in small r up to second order the $\nabla_X^2 - \nabla_Y^2$ term renormalizes the velocity u_σ . We neglect this contribution since the change of velocity does not affect the physics of the problem in an essential way. We retain on the contrary $\nabla_X^2 + \nabla_Y^2$, which can be simplified using $(\nabla_X^2 + \nabla_Y^2) \log(R) = 2\pi \delta(R)$.

Using polar coordinates the full term becomes:

$$\frac{K_\sigma^2 g^2}{4\pi^2 \alpha^4 u_\sigma^2} e^{-\frac{2D_f K_\sigma^2}{u_\sigma^2} |x_a|} F_1(r_a) \int_{r>\alpha} dr e^{-4K_\sigma F_1(r)} r^3 F\left(\frac{8D_f K_\sigma^2}{u_\sigma^2} r\right) \quad (\text{A7})$$

where F has been defined in (33)

Looking at the contribution of $\int_\alpha^{\alpha+d\alpha} dx$ where we define $\alpha = \alpha_0 e^l$, we obtain the RG equations for K_σ (30) and g (31).

4. Disorder renormalization equations

We now look at the first term of (A6) multiplied by (A5). We discuss the case $x_a > 0$ since the other case can be similarly done. Since for large disorders, the 2 exponentials $e^{-\frac{2K_\sigma^2 D_f}{u_\sigma^2} |x_a| - \frac{8K_\sigma^2 D_f}{u_\sigma^2} |x_1 - x_2|}$ which we don't expand would suppress completely this term, we can expand the exponentials

containing the "crossed" disorder terms and the exponential containing the F_1 terms at first order.

We now have also to separate the integrals on x_1 and x_2 to treat all cases coming from the heaviside functions. Those split in 4 categories (our chains have size $2L$): $\int_0^{x_a} dx_1 \int_0^{x_1} dx_2$, $\int_0^{x_a} dx_1 \int_{-L}^0 dx_2$, $\int_{x_a}^L dx_1 \int_{-L}^{x_a} dx_2$, $\int_{x_a}^L dx_1 \int_{-L}^0 dx_2$.

Since the term is suppressed exponentially in $|x_1 - x_2|$, the fourth category of integrals is negligible since the minimal interval between x_1 and x_2 is L which is half the size of the system. The most important contribution comes from the first term, which covers most of the $|x_1 - x_2|$ "small" region, and gives us the renormalization that we use. Finally, the second and third term are "marginally relevant" in the sense that while they have also possibilities of having small $|x_1 - x_2|$, they have only one point where x_1 and x_2 are at the same point. This last terms would give rise to less relevant terms in the renormalization equations.

Another way of looking at it is that we are looking at the effect of having disorder on two points x_1 and x_2 on the correlations related to two fixed point x_a and 0. Now, since the effect of x_1 and x_2 is suppressed if they are far from each other, given the splitting of our integral, the importance of each contribution is related to the amount of possibilities to have x_1 and x_2 close together.

We then go to the center of mass and relative coordinates and perform first the integral on the center of mass coordinates, doing first the integral on the center of mass "time". We are now looking at:

$$\begin{aligned} & 16 \frac{8D_f K_\sigma^3}{u_\sigma^4} \int dy \int_0^{x_a} dx e^{-\frac{8D_f K_\sigma^2}{u_\sigma^2} |x|} e^{-4K_\sigma F_1(r)} x^2 \\ & \cdot \int_{x_a - x/2}^{x/2} dX \int dY \nabla_X [F_1(-R) - F_1(r_a - R)] \quad (\text{A8}) \end{aligned}$$

which then leads to:

$$16\pi \frac{8D_f K_\sigma^3}{u_\sigma^4} \int dy \int_0^{x_a} dx e^{-\frac{8D_f K_\sigma^2}{u_\sigma^2} |x|} e^{-4K_\sigma F_1(r)} x^2 (x_a - x) \quad (\text{A9})$$

After going to polar coordinates and doing the integration, we end up with:

$$16\pi \frac{8D_f K_\sigma^3}{u_\sigma^4} \left[\int_0^{x_a} dr r^3 e^{-4K_\sigma F_1(r)} x_a G \left(\frac{8D_f K_\sigma^2}{u_\sigma^2} r \right) - \int_0^{x_a} dr r^4 e^{-4K_\sigma F_1(r)} M \left(\frac{8D_f K_\sigma^2}{u_\sigma^2} r \right) \right] \quad (\text{A10})$$

with

$$M(x) = \frac{4}{3} - \pi(I_3(x) - L_1(x)) - \pi \frac{I_2(x) - L_2(x)}{x} \quad (\text{A11})$$

In this last expression, the second term leads to a new RG equation which is less relevant. The first term instead, when reexponentiated leads to the RG equation for the disorder (32).

5. Correlation function renormalization

The last element that we needed comes from the linear term in g . By splitting the integral on dx in order to deal with the heaviside functions, we find that the disorder term can be rewritten uniformly as: $e^{-\frac{2K_\sigma^2 D_f}{u_\sigma^2} |x_a|}$. Finally, combining all of this terms together, we derive the RG equation of the correlation function (35).

Appendix B: Details on the interpretation of the RG equations

We can play around a bit with our RG equations (30), (31), (32) by noticing that in all of them the disorder strength $D_{f,m}$ is accompanied by α . This suggests making a change of variable $\tilde{D} = D_{f,m} \alpha$ (the quantity which we compare to g to decide who won the RG).

This leads to the following RG equations :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dK_\sigma}{dl} &= -\frac{g^2 K_\sigma^2}{2\pi^2 u_\sigma^2} F \left(\frac{8K_\sigma^2 \tilde{D}}{u_\sigma^2} \right) \\ \frac{dg}{dl} &= (2 - 2K_\sigma)g \\ \frac{d\tilde{D}}{dl} &= \left(1 - \frac{g^2 K_\sigma}{\pi^3 u_\sigma^2} G \left(\frac{8K_\sigma^2 \tilde{D}}{u_\sigma^2} \right) \right) \tilde{D} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B1})$$

In this form the competition between g and \tilde{D} is evident. Both would be diverging exponentials if the other is set to 0 and both are contained (or even suppressed for the equation of \tilde{D}) by the other. The main question which stays at this stage is which one of the two will diverge first.

Since F and G are complicated functions which have simple power law behaviours at large argument, we can also expand them at large argument. Particular attention should be given that this means that \tilde{D} is large, and therefore $D \neq 0$. So this expansion describes well the case where the disorder

wins while one has to be more careful if g wins the RG. We then get the following expressions for the RG equations :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dK_\sigma}{dl} &= -\frac{g^2}{8\pi^3 D_{f,m}} \frac{1}{\alpha} \\ \frac{dg}{dl} &= (2 - 2K_\sigma)g \\ \frac{dD_{f,m}}{dl} &= -\frac{2g^2 u_\sigma^4}{8^3 \pi^3 D_{f,m}^2 K_\sigma^5} \frac{1}{\alpha^3} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B2})$$

where $\alpha = \alpha_o e^l$. Here we can see clearly the competition between disorder and g if we do the same variable change as just above. However, another change of variable illustrates another aspect of our RG. If we redefine our parameter $g \rightarrow \tilde{g} = \frac{g}{\sqrt{\alpha}}$, we get for the RG equations :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dK_\sigma}{dl} &= -\frac{\tilde{g}^2}{8\pi^3 D_{f,m}} \\ \frac{d\tilde{g}}{dl} &= (3/2 - 2K_\sigma)\tilde{g} \\ \frac{dD_{f,m}}{dl} &= -\frac{2\tilde{g}^2 u_\sigma^4}{8^3 \pi^3 D_{f,m}^2 K_\sigma^5} \frac{1}{\alpha^2} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B3})$$

Since this expressions are valid at large $D_{f,m} \alpha$, the disorder equations shows us that the parameter $D_{f,m}$ is in practice frozen. But the main interest here is the second equation, the one for \tilde{g} . We see that \tilde{g} is relevant for $K_\sigma > 0.75$, which is reminiscent of the case of a backward disorder that would exist only in the spin sector [28].

Appendix C: Different velocities

1. Model $g = 0$

For the following, we treat here the charge velocity and spin velocity as different. The susceptibility of one chain $\chi_o(q=0, \omega=0)$ is then given by :

$$\chi_o(0,0) = \int dx \int_0^{\beta c} d\tau R_\rho(r_\rho) R_\sigma(r_\sigma) \quad (\text{C1})$$

where $r_\rho^2 = x^2 + (u_\rho \tau)^2$ and $r_\sigma^2 = x^2 + (u_\sigma \tau)^2$, we neglect the factors of α inside $r_{\rho/\sigma}$. We make the change of variables $u_\sigma \tau = y$, which when passing in polar coordinates leads us to :

$$\chi_o(0,0) = \frac{1}{4u_\sigma} \int_{\alpha_o}^{u_\sigma \beta c} dr r^{-\frac{1}{k_\rho}} \cdot \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta \frac{e^{-\frac{2K_\sigma^2 D_{f,m}}{u_\sigma^2} |x|}}{\left(\cos(\theta)^2 + \frac{u_\rho^2}{u_\sigma^2} \sin(\theta)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{k_\rho}}} \quad (\text{C2})$$

As we can see in Fig. 7, the difference between the cases where we consider $u_\sigma = u_\rho$ or where we take their real




FIG. 7. Plots of the behavior of the critical temperature by respect of disorder comparing both treatments of u_ρ/u_σ as described in the main text and in this appendix.

values coming from their definition (12) is minimal. So the qualitative behavior can be quite well described analytically by the expression (26) without taking into account the difference of the speeds, while if one wants to be slightly more quantitative, one can refer to the expression tracking the difference between u_ρ and u_σ .

2. Model $g \neq 0$

In the same spirit as above, the susceptibility is now given as a function of two different $r : r_\rho$ and r_σ .

$$\chi_o(0,0) = \int dx \int_0^{\beta_c} d\tau R_\rho(r_\rho) R_\sigma(r_\sigma) \quad (C3)$$

Which then lead by the same change of variables $u_\sigma \tau = y$ to :

$$\chi_o(0,0) = \frac{1}{4u_\sigma} \int_{\alpha_o}^{\beta_c} dr r^{1-K_\sigma - \frac{1}{k_\rho}} e^{-\int_0^{\ln(r/\alpha_o)} \frac{gdl}{\pi u_\sigma}} \cdot e^{\int_0^{\ln(\frac{r}{\alpha_o})} dl \frac{k_\sigma^2 g^2}{2\pi^2 u_\sigma^2} \ln(r) F(A(l))} \cdot \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta \frac{e^{-\left(\frac{2k_\sigma^2 D_{f,m}}{u_\sigma^2} - \int_0^{\ln(r/\alpha_o)} dl \frac{4g^2 D_{f,m} k_\sigma^3}{\pi^3 u_\sigma^4} G(A(l))\right) |x|}}{\left(\cos(\theta)^2 + \frac{u_\rho^2}{u_\sigma^2} \sin(\theta)^2\right)^{\frac{1}{k_\rho}}} \quad (C4)$$

and we can again see in Figure 8, that we qualitative behaviour is the same in both treatments of the speeds for both regimes of the RG.

-
- [1] A. Abrikosov and L. Gorkov, Contribution to the theory of superconducting alloys with paramagnetic impurities, Soviet Physics JETP-USSR **12**, 1243 (1961).
 - [2] P. W. Anderson, Theory of dirty superconductors, j. Phys. Chem. Solids **11**, 4 (1959).
 - [3] C. Varma, Thirty years of heavy fermions: Scientific setting for their discovery and partial understanding, *Physica B: Condensed Matter* **378-380**, 17 (2006).
 - [4] D. Jerome and C. Bourbonnais, Quasi one-dimensional organic conductors: from fröhlich conductivity and peierls insulating state to magnetically-mediated superconductivity, a retrospective, *Comptes Rendus de Physique* **25**, 17 (2024).
 - [5] H. Alloul, J. Bobroff, M. Gabay, and P. Hirschfeld, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 45 (2009).
 - [6] C. Huscroft and R. T. Scalettar, Effect of disorder on charge-density wave and superconducting order in the half-filled attractive hubbard model, *Physical Review B* **55**, 1185 (1997).
 - [7] V. Dobrosavljevic and G. Kotliar, No Title, Physical Review Letters **78**, 3943 (1997).
 - [8] L. Benfatto, C. Castellani, and T. Giamarchi, Doping dependence of the vortex-core energy in bilayer films of cuprates, *Physical Review B* **77**, 100506(R) (2008).
 - [9] Y. Dubi, Y. Meir, and Y. Avishai, Nature **449**, 876 (2008).
 - [10] P. W. Anderson, Absence of diffusion in certain random lattices, Physical Review **109**, 1492 (1958).
 - [11] Y. Suzumura and T. Giamarchi, Journal of the Physical Society of Japan **58**, 1748 (1989).
 - [12] A. Lowe, V. Kagalovsky, and I. V. Yurkevich, Disorder-enhanced superconductivity in a quasi-one-dimensional strongly correlated system, *Physical Review Research* **3**, 033059 (2021).
 - [13] V. L. Berezinskii, Journal of Experimental and Theoretical




FIG. 8. Plots of the behaviour of the critical temperature by respect of disorder comparing both treatments of u_ρ/u_σ as described in the main text and in this appendix in both regimes of the RG.

- Physics **38**, 620 (1974).
- [14] A. A. Abrikosov and J. A. Rhyzkin, adv. Phys. **27**, 147 (1978).
- [15] T. Giamarchi and H. J. Schulz, Anderson localization and interactions in one-dimensional metals, Physical Review B **37**, 325 (1988).
- [16] I. Bloch, J. Dalibard, and W. Zwerger, Many-body physics with ultracold gases, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **80**, 885 (2008).
- [17] T. Esslinger, Fermi-Hubbard Physics with Atoms in an Optical Lattice, *Annual Review of Condensed Matter Physics* **1**, 129 (2010), arXiv:1007.0012 [cond-mat.quant-gas].

- [18] G. Roati, C. D'Errico, L. Fallani, M. Fattori, C. Fort, M. Zaccanti, G. Modugno, M. Modugno, and M. Inguscio, Anderson localization of a non-interacting bose-einstein condensate, *Nature* **453**, 895 (2008).
- [19] J. Billy, V. Josse, Z. Zuo, A. Bernard, B. Hambrecht, P. Lugan, D. Clement, L. Sanchez-Palencia, P. Bouyer, and A. Aspect, Direct observation of anderson localization of matter waves in a controlled disorder, *Nature* **453**, 891 (2008).
- [20] L. Sanchez-Palencia and M. Lewenstein, Disordered quantum gases under control, *Nat. Phys.* **6**, 87 (2010).
- [21] L. Fallani, J. E. Lye, V. Guarrera, C. Fort, and M. Inguscio, No Title, *Physical Review Letters* **98**, 130404 (2007).
- [22] C. D'Errico, E. Lucioni, L. Tanzi, L. Gori, G. Roux, I. P. McCulloch, T. Giamarchi, M. Inguscio, and G. Modugno, Observation of a disordered bosonic insulator from weak to strong interactions, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 095301 (2014).
- [23] F. Jendrzejewski, A. Bernard, K. Müller, P. Cheinet, V. Josse, M. Piraud, L. Pezzé, L. Sanchez-Palencia, A. Aspect, and P. Bouyer, Three-dimensional localization of ultracold atoms in an optical disordered potential, *Nature Physics* **8**, 398 (2012).
- [24] M. Schreiber, S. S. Hodgman, P. Bordia, H. P. Lüschen, M. H. Fischer, R. Vosk, E. Altman, U. Schneider, and I. Bloch, *Science* **349**, 842 (2015).
- [25] H. Yao, A. Khoudli, L. Bresque, and L. Sanchez-Palencia, Critical behavior and fractality in shallow one-dimensional quasiperiodic potentials, *Physical Review Letters* **123**, 070405 (2019).
- [26] H. Yao, T. Giamarchi, and L. Sanchez-Palencia, Lieb-liniger bosons in a shallow quasiperiodic potential: Bose glass phase and fractal mott lobes, *Physical Review Letters* **125**, 060401 (2020).
- [27] M. Sbroscia, K. Viebahn, E. Carter, J.-C. Yu, A. Gaunt, and U. Schneider, Observing localization in a 2d quasicrystalline optical lattice, *Physical Review Letters* **125**, 200604 (2020).
- [28] T. Giamarchi, *Quantum Physics in One Dimension*, International series of monographs on physics, Vol. 121 (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2004).
- [29] P. Lugan, A. Aspect, L. Sanchez-Palencia, D. Delande, B. Grémaud, C. A. Müller, and C. Miniatura, *Physical Review A* **80**, 023605 (2009).
- [30] T. Giamarchi, *Physical Review B* **46**, 342 (1992).
- [31] E. Orignac, T. Giamarchi, and P. L. Doussal, Possible new phase of commensurate insulators with disorder: The mott glass, *Physical Review Letters* **83**, 2378 (1999).
- [32] T. Giamarchi, P. Le Doussal, and E. Orignac, No Title, *Physical Review B* **64**, 245119 (2001).
- [33] T. Giamarchi and H. J. Schulz, *Physical Review B* **39**, 4620 (1989).
- [34] B. Horowitz, T. Bohr, J. M. Kosterlitz, and H. J. Schulz, No Title, *Physical Review B* **28**, 6596 (1983).
- [35] R. A. Hart, P. M. Duarte, T. Yang, X. Liu, T. Paiva, E. Khatami, R. T. Scalettar, N. Trivedi, D. A. Huse, and R. G. Hulet, Observation of antiferromagnetic correlations in the hubbard model with ultracold atoms, *Nature* **519**, 211 (2015).
- [36] M. Boll, T. A. Hilker, G. Salomon, A. Omran, J. Nespolo, L. Pollet, I. Bloch, and C. Gross, Spin- and density resolved microscopy of antiferromagnetic correlations in fermi-hubbard chains, *Science* **353**, 1257 (2016).
- [37] W. S. Bakr, J. I. Gillen, A. Peng, S. Fölling, and M. Greiner, A quantum gas microscope for detecting single atoms in a hubbard-regime optical lattice, *Nature* **462**, 74 (2009).
- [38] A. F. Ho, M. A. Cazalilla, and T. Giamarchi, Quantum simulation of the hubbard model: The attractive route, *Physical Review A* **79**, 033620 (2009).
- [39] F. Wu, I. Gutierrez-Lezama, S. A. Lopez-Paz, M. Gibertini, K. Watanabe, T. Taniguchi, F. O. von Rohr, N. Ubrig, and A. F. Morpurgo, Quasi-1d electronic transport in a 2d magnetic semiconductor, *Advanced Materials* , 2109759 (2022).