

Thermopower across Fermi-volume-changing quantum phase transitions without symmetry breaking

Peter Lunts,^{1,*} Aavishkar A. Patel,² and Subir Sachdev¹

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

²*Center for Computational Quantum Physics, Flatiron Institute, 162 5th Avenue, New York, NY 10010, USA*

(Dated: December 23, 2024)

We describe the evolution of low-temperature thermopower across Fermi-volume-changing quantum phase transitions in Kondo lattice models without symmetry breaking. This transition moves from a heavy Fermi liquid with a conventional Luttinger-volume large Fermi surface to an ‘FL*’ state, characterized by a small Fermi surface and a spin liquid with fractionalized excitations. The onset of the large Fermi surface phase is driven by the condensation of a Higgs field that carries a unit gauge charge under an emergent U(1) gauge field. We consider the case with spatially random Kondo exchange, as this leads to strange metal behavior in electrical transport. We find a large asymmetric thermopower. Our findings are consistent with recent observations in heavy fermion compounds (Z.-Y. Cao *et al.*, arXiv:2408.13604), and describe an enhancement of thermopower on the large Fermi surface side as well as a non-monotonic behavior on the small Fermi surface side.

Our results also apply to single-band Hubbard models and the pseudogap transition in the cuprates. In the ancilla framework, single-band models exhibit an *inverted* Kondo lattice transition: the small Fermi surface pseudogap state corresponds to the condensed Higgs state. This inversion results in an enhancement of thermopower on the pseudogap side in our theory, consistent with observations in the cuprates (C. Collignon *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **103**, 155102 (2021); A. Gourgout *et al.*, Phys. Rev. X **12**, 011037 (2022)). We argue that these observations support a non-symmetry-breaking Fermi-volume-changing transition as the underlying description of the onset of the pseudogap in the cuprates.

I. INTRODUCTION

A number of recent experiments have explored the thermopower of metallic correlated electron compounds across Fermi-volume-changing transitions [1–6]. This paper aims to provide theoretical insight into these observations using a model of non-zero temperature quantum criticality across Fermi-volume-changing quantum phase transitions without symmetry breaking, introduced in Refs. [7, 8] (see also Ref. [9]). We will show that thermopower is an especially sensitive probe of key features of such non-symmetry-breaking transitions, and the enhancement and asymmetry of the thermopower observations support such a non-symmetry-breaking description of the heavy fermion compounds and the cuprates.

Although symmetry-breaking phases may be present nearby, we will assume that the main physics at intermediate temperatures is that of a Fermi volume change, and that symmetry breaking is a secondary, lower temperature phenomenon. As the Luttinger relation constrains the Fermi volume by the total electron density, it follows that, in the absence of symmetry breaking, at least one of the metallic phases does not obey the Luttinger relation. Such non-Luttinger-volume metallic phases are permitted in the presence of fractionalization [7, 8, 10–12] by an extension of Oshikawa’s argument for the Luttinger volume in a Fermi liquid [13].

It is conventional to refer to the Luttinger volume Fermi surface as a ‘large’ Fermi surface; the phase with

a large Fermi surface is a conventional Fermi liquid, and we will denote it as FL. The non-Luttinger volume Fermi surface is ‘small’, and the phase with a small Fermi surface is a ‘fractionalized Fermi liquid’ [7], and we will denote it as FL*. We assume that fractionalization is present in the intermediate temperature FL* phase, but any symmetry breaking phases that may be present nearby at low temperatures are conventional, and do not have fractionalization.

It is a relatively simple matter to obtain a FL-to-FL* transition in a Kondo lattice model [7, 8] as illustrated in Fig. 1. The Kondo lattice will serve as our model for Fermi volume-changing transitions in the heavy-fermion compounds [1, 2, 6, 15–20].

It is a far more subtle matter to obtain Fermi-volume-changing transitions without symmetry breaking in single-band electron models. Such transitions are of relevance to studies of the crossover from the pseudogap to the Fermi liquid in the intermediate temperature regime of the cuprates [3, 4, 21–25], and also in organic compounds [5]. We note that our main computations for thermopower in Sections II and III are carried out using a two-band Kondo lattice model. These results can be directly applied to the heavy-fermion compounds. Readers not interested in the extension to the single-band model appropriate for the cuprates may skip over the associated discussion.

There are complementary frameworks for describing a FL*-FL transition in single-band models [26, 27], linked by duality in the insulating limit [28].

The ancilla framework [27] uses a bilayer of ancilla qubits, and its main ideas are illustrated in Fig. 2. It

* plunts@fas.harvard.edu




Figure 1: Fermi volume changing transition in a Kondo lattice of spins of f electrons and a conduction band of c electrons (from Ref. [14]). The x -axis is the Kondo coupling between the c and f electrons, denoted as J_K . In the fractionalized Fermi liquid (FL*) phase the f electrons form a spin liquid with fractionalized spinon excitations, while the c electrons form a ‘small’ Fermi surface. In the FL phase, the f and c electrons hybridize, and realize a ‘large’ Fermi surface which has the Luttinger volume of free electrons.





Figure 2: Fermi volume changing transition in the ancilla theory of the single band Hubbard model (from Ref. [14]; see Appendix A). The physical electrons (c_α) are in the single-band top layer, and two layers of ancilla qubits are realized by a bilayer antiferromagnet (with interlayer exchange J_\perp) with spins \mathbf{S}_1 and \mathbf{S}_2 . The \mathbf{S}_1 are coupled to the physical electrons by the Kondo coupling J_K . For $J_\perp \gg J_K$, the ancilla $\mathbf{S}_{1,2}$ spins form rung singlets, and a FL phase is present in the c_α layer. For $J_K \gg J_\perp$, we obtain the FL* phase in which the c_α electrons hybridize with the g_a fermions representing the \mathbf{S}_1 spins to form a Fermi surface similar to the large Fermi surface of the Kondo lattice model in Fig. 1, while the \mathbf{S}_2 spins form a spin liquid with neutral spinon excitations.

is argued that the ancilla qubits can be decoupled by a canonical transformation, leaving behind a single-band Hubbard-like model for the physics c_α electrons (see (A1) and Appendix A). As illustrated in Fig. 2, we obtain a FL* phase when the bottom ancilla layer forms a spin liquid, while the top two layers combine as in a Kondo lattice to realized a small Fermi volume of Fermi liquid-like quasiparticles. On the other hand, the conventional FL phase is obtain when the two ancilla layers form a trivial rung-singlet state. Note the inversion between Figs. 1 and 2 which plays a key role in our analysis: the FL* phase appears for small Kondo coupling J_K in

the Kondo lattice in Fig. 1, while the FL* phase appears for large J_K in the single-band model in Fig. 2.

The second framework employs a bosonic spinon description of the spinons in the pseudogap phase [26, 29–38]. There are encouraging comparisons of this theory to experimental data [39] and numerical studies [33, 34, 36]. The discussion in the present paper will use the ancilla framework, but our conclusions here on FL*-FL Fermi-volume-changing transitions in single band models apply also to this second framework.

This paper will describe the thermopower in the non-zero temperature quantum-critical region of the Fermi-



Single band model has an inverted Kondo lattice transition

Figure 3: Contrasting the FL-FL* transition between the Kondo lattice and single-band model. For the Kondo lattice, the FL has the Higgs boson b condensed. On the other hand, for the single-band model, the FL* phase has the Higgs boson Φ condensed (see Appendix A).

volume-changing transition [40–43]. Kim and Pépin [42] argued that the thermopower is mostly symmetrical on the two sides of the quantum phase transition for symmetry-breaking transitions. But, as Georges and Mravlje have argued [43], a large asymmetric thermopower (inside of the critical fan) can appear in other cases [40–43]. Our primary focus in this paper is the nature of this asymmetry, and its distinct behaviors between the transitions in Figs. 1 and 2. As we show in Fig. 3, the Kondo lattice transition is associated with the condensation of a Higgs boson b in the FL phase. In contrast, the single-band Hubbard model has a similar Higgs boson Φ condensed on the FL* side (see Appendix A). These features are responsible for one of our main results: the thermopower asymmetry is *inverted* between the Kondo lattice and single-band models. As we discuss below, the computed asymmetry of the thermopower is in good accord with that observed in the Kondo lattice system CeRhIn₅ [6], which is inverted to that observed in the cuprate La_{1.6-x}Nd_{0.4}Sr_xCuO₄ [3, 4] (presumed to be described by a single band model).

In both cases in Fig. 3, the boson action has a non-relativistic form with a linear in time derivative term (see (4)), and it is this feature which results in singular asymmetric contributions to the thermopower near the quantum-critical point. In contrast, there is no such linear in time derivative for symmetry-breaking transitions [42], and this is ultimately responsible for their nearly symmetric behavior, and weak thermopower.

Our specific computations are carried out in a Kondo lattice model with a spatially random Kondo coupling introduced by Aldape *et al.* [44], which we present in Section II. It has been argued [45–49] that including spatial randomness in the interactions is essential near quantum-critical points in metals. Spatially random interactions lead directly to spatial variations in the local position of the quantum-critical point, and such ‘Harris disorder’ is

a strongly-relevant perturbation. The quantum-critical transport properties of metals are not sensible in the absence of randomness [50–57]. Moreover, spatially random interactions lead naturally to the observed marginal Fermi liquid (MFL) behavior in the electron self energy, and linear-in-temperature electrical resistivity. Including particle-hole asymmetry, we find a “skewed MFL”, with similarities to the skewed non-Fermi liquid of Georges and Mravlje [43] (see discussion below (8)).

Thermopower computations in the model of Section II appear in Section III, along with a comparison to the experimental observations. We conclude in Section IV with a summary and discussion of implications.

II. THEORY

Our computations are carried out for the Kondo Lattice Hamiltonian from the theory of Ref. [44], given by

$$\begin{aligned}
 H &= \sum_{\rho=\{c_\sigma, f_\sigma, b\}} H_\rho + H_{\text{int}} \\
 H_\rho &= \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_k (\epsilon_{\rho,k} - \mu_\rho) \rho_{k,i}^\dagger \rho_{k,i}, \\
 H_{\text{int}} &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i,j,l=1}^N \sum_{r,\sigma} (g'_{ijl}(r) c_{r,i,\sigma}^\dagger f_{r,j,\sigma} b_{r,l} + \text{H.c.}), \\
 &\sum_{i=1}^N (b_{r,i}^\dagger b_{r,i} - \sum_\sigma f_{r,i,\sigma}^\dagger f_{r,i,\sigma}) = N\kappa, \quad (1)
 \end{aligned}$$

where c_σ, f_σ are conduction and f electrons, and σ is a spin index. An auxiliary index i has been introduced for facilitating a large N expansion. The b are (Higgs) bosons mediating the hybridization between the c and

f electrons. The $g'_{ijl}(r)$ are complex Gaussian random variables with variance

$$\overline{g'_{ijl}(r)g'_{i'j'l'}(r')} = g'^2 \delta_{r,r'} \delta_{i,i'} \delta_{j,j'} \delta_{l,l'}, \quad (2)$$

which leads to a spatially disordered interaction. This interaction is the result of a Hubbard-Stratonovich decoupling of the original (spatially disordered) Kondo interaction J_K . The dispersion of itinerant electrons $\epsilon_{c,k}$ is a generalized tight-binding one for the square lattice and that of the bosons is taken to be quadratic:

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_{c,k} &= -2t(\cos(k_x) + \cos(k_y)) - 4t' \cos(k_x) \cos(k_y) \\ &\quad - 2t''(\cos(2k_x) + \cos(2k_y)), \\ \epsilon_{b,k} &= \frac{k^2}{2m_b}. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

To be concrete, for the hopping amplitudes t, t', t'' and chemical potential μ_c we use the experimental values measured for the cuprate of interest $\text{La}_{1.6-x}\text{Nd}_{0.4}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4$, which are given in Ref. [3, 4] (see Appendix B). The precise details of the dispersion for the itinerant c electrons is not important for the results we obtain, and we therefore use the same dispersion when modeling the transition both for the Kondo lattice and single-band cases. The dispersion of the f -electrons, on the other hand, is expected to be very different between the two physical systems. In the case of the Kondo lattice model we take them to be heavy, with a simple quadratic dispersion (c.f. Sec. III B). In the single-band model we take it to be the same as the dispersion of the c electrons (it can be computed by a mean-field calculation of the ancilla theory [27] in the pseudogap phase, although the exact form is not crucial for the results of this paper; we note that the thermopower is not affected by any kind of “nesting” between the two Fermi surfaces, as their contributions are separate, and therefore this simplification does not lead to any anomalous features of the Seebeck coefficient). Our computations are carried out in two spatial dimensions. The two-dimensionality is important for the bosonic sector, but the results remain similar if the fermionic sector is three-dimensional (as is the case of YbRh_2Si_2 [58]).

The constraint parameter κ is what tunes the theory across the QCP, whose critical value is denoted as κ_c and the deviation defined as $\Delta\kappa \equiv \kappa - \kappa_c$. For $\Delta\kappa > 0$, the boson b is condensed, while for $\Delta\kappa < 0$ it remains uncondensed. The resulting physical scenarios for the Kondo lattice and single-band models are illustrated in Fig. 3.

A. Propagators at large- N

We work in the large N limit, in which the theory is controlled by a self-consistent one-loop saddle point. At this saddle point, the boson Green’s function is given by

$$G_b(i\omega, \mathbf{k}) = \frac{1}{-i\omega + \mathbf{k}^2/(2m_b) + \gamma|\omega| + \Delta_b(T)}. \quad (4)$$

Note the $-i\omega$ term, which will ultimately be responsible for the singular asymmetry in the fermion self-energies, and hence the large thermopower; this term was not present in the analyses of Refs. [45–49]. For the boson, the self-energy correction leads to a Landau damping term, with a coefficient given by

$$\gamma = \frac{g'^2 \nu_c \nu_f}{2\pi}, \quad (5)$$

where $\nu_{c/f}$ are the density of states at the Fermi level of the c and f fermions, respectively. The boson gap $\Delta_b(T)$ is obtained by solving the self-consistent equation for $z \equiv \Delta_b(T)/T$:

$$\begin{aligned} &2\pi^2 \frac{\Delta\kappa}{Tm_b} \\ &= \int_0^\infty \frac{dx}{e^x - 1} \left[\arctan\left(\frac{\gamma x}{z - x}\right) + \arctan\left(\frac{\gamma x}{z + x}\right) \right] \\ &\quad - \pi \log(1 - e^{-z}) - \frac{\gamma}{1 + \gamma^2} z \log\left(\frac{\Lambda e}{zT}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where Λ is a UV cutoff scale that comes from the boson bandwidth that we take to be large: $\Lambda/T \gg 1$.

The retarded fermion self-energies written in the variables $x = \omega/T, z = \Delta_b/T$ are given by (see Appendix C)

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{\rho,R}(T, x, z) &= \gamma \frac{Tm_b}{2\nu_\rho} \left[-\frac{x}{\pi} \log\left(\frac{\Lambda}{2\pi T}\right) - (-1)^{s_\rho} i \frac{x}{2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - i \log\left(\frac{\pi \operatorname{csch}\left(\frac{z}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{2} - i \frac{x - (-1)^{s_\rho} z - x}{2\pi}\right)^2}\right) \right] + C_\rho(T), \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where $s_c = 0, s_f = 1$, and $C_\rho(T)$ is a real frequency-independent term, which can be absorbed into the chemical potential. Importantly, Eq. (6) is given for the case of $\gamma \ll 1$. The reason for taking this limiting behavior is that it leads to the “skewed” nature [43, 44] of the scattering rates (see below). From here on, we work in this parameter regime.

Both fermions exhibit a marginal Fermi liquid (MFL) scaling of their self-energies with T, ω . The total scattering rate $\Gamma_\rho(T, \omega)$ is given by

$$\Gamma_{\rho,\text{tot}} = \Gamma_\rho - 2 \operatorname{Im} \Sigma_\rho(x, z, T) = \Gamma_\rho + \lambda_\rho \pi T g_\rho(x, z), \quad (7)$$

where Γ_ρ is the elastic scattering component, $x = \omega/T, z = \Delta_b/T, \lambda_\rho = \frac{\gamma m_b}{\pi \nu_\rho}$ is an interaction scale, and

$$g_\rho(x, z) = (-1)^{s_\rho} \frac{x}{2} + \operatorname{Re} \left[\log \left(\frac{\pi \operatorname{csch}\left(\frac{z}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{2} + i \frac{(-1)^{s_\rho} z - x}{2\pi}\right)^2} \right) \right] \quad (8)$$

is a dimensionless function. Crucially, its form dictates the presence of singular particle-hole asymmetry in both MFLs: $g_\rho(x, z)$ contains terms that are both odd and

even in x . Following Georges and Mravlje [43], we call this electron state a “skewed” MFL. Comparing to the analogous function $g(x)$ of Ref. [43], $g_\rho(x, z)$ has a more complicated structure due to the T dependence of the mass gap ratio $z(T)$ (which is only a logarithmic T dependence in the quantum-critical region). Ref. [43] analyzed a theory exactly at a critical point with conformal symmetry, building on the large particle-hole asymmetry in the Sachdev-Ye-Kitaev model [59–68], that has a T -independent $z(T)$.

To a good approximation, the renormalized quasi-particle weights $Z_\rho(T, \omega)$ can be estimated as energy-independent, $Z_\rho(T, \omega) \approx Z_\rho(T, \omega = 0)$ [43]. They are then computed as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{Z_\rho(T)} &= 1 - \frac{1}{T} \left. \frac{\partial \text{Re} \Sigma_\rho(x, T)}{\partial x} \right|_{x=0} \\ &= 1 + \frac{\lambda_\rho}{2} \left[\log \left(\frac{\Lambda}{2\pi T} \right) - \text{Re} \psi \left(\frac{1}{2} + i \frac{z}{2\pi} \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where $\psi(x)$ is the digamma function. This logarithmic form is what is expected for a MFL. The second term involving the digamma function is essentially constant in temperature, as can be confirmed numerically.

III. SEEBECK COEFFICIENT

The thermopower is given by (e here denotes electric charge)

$$S = -\frac{L_1}{e L_0}, \quad (10)$$

with the L_n are called Onsager coefficients and are given by

$$L_0 = -\lim_{\omega \rightarrow 0} \frac{\text{Im} \Pi_{JJ}(\omega)}{\omega} \quad (11)$$

$$L_1 = -\frac{1}{T} \lim_{\omega \rightarrow 0} \frac{\text{Im} \Pi_{J_Q J}(\omega)}{\omega}, \quad (12)$$

where J is the electrical current and J_Q is the heat current. Each current is the sum of currents from all three species: $J = \sum_{\rho=c,f,b} J^{(\rho)}$, $J_Q = \sum_{\rho=c,f,b} J_Q^{(\rho)}$. From here on we set $k_B = e = 1$ (except when we restore them in final results).

Importantly, in this model, to the order in $1/N$ we are working, all cross-current correlators vanish. Therefore, the correlators reduce to the sum over single species ones, and so do the L_n ,

$$L_0^{(\rho)} = -\sigma_\rho \lim_{\omega \rightarrow 0} \frac{\text{Im} \Pi_{J^{(\rho)} J^{(\rho)}}(\omega)}{\omega} \quad (13)$$

$$L_1^{(\rho)} = -\frac{1}{T} \sigma_\rho \lim_{\omega \rightarrow 0} \frac{\text{Im} \Pi_{J_Q^{(\rho)} J^{(\rho)}}(\omega)}{\omega}, \quad (14)$$

where σ_ρ is the spin degeneracy of the species: $\sigma_{c,f} = 2, \sigma_b = 1$. Using the notation of Ref. [43], we can write them as

$$L_n^{(\rho)} = \frac{1}{T^n} \int d\omega \left(-\frac{\partial f_\rho}{\partial \omega} \right) \omega^n \mathcal{T}^{(\rho)}(\omega), \quad (15)$$

where f_ρ is the occupation function of each species, and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}^{(\rho)}(\omega) &= \sigma_\rho \pi \int \frac{d^2 k}{(2\pi)^2} v_{\rho, \mathbf{k}}^2 A_\rho(\mathbf{k}, \omega)^2 \\ &= \pi \int d\epsilon \Phi(\epsilon) A_\rho(\epsilon, \omega)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where

$$\Phi(\epsilon) = \sigma_\rho \int \frac{d^2 k}{(2\pi)^2} v_{\rho, \mathbf{k}}^2 \delta(\epsilon - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^{(\rho)}). \quad (17)$$

is the transport function and $A_\rho(\mathbf{k}, \omega)$ is the spectral function.

The emergent $U(1)$ gauge field that couples f and b will act to renormalize the current vertices. In the calculation of the electrical conductivity this leads to exact Ioffe-Larkin constraints on the current correlators, giving a combination of in-series and in-parallel current additions.

Although both electrical and thermal current vertices should get renormalized, at the order of $1/N$ we are working at, the renormalizations to the thermal current vertex cancel; see Appendix D. This leads to a convoluted relationship of the currents of the different species, which cannot be simply summarized as in-parallel or in-series addition. The Onsager coefficients are written as

$$L_0 = L_0^{(c)} + \left(\left(L_0^{(f)} \right)^{-1} + \left(L_0^{(b)} \right)^{-1} \right)^{-1} \quad (18)$$

$$L_1 = L_1^{(c)} - \frac{L_1^{(f)} L_0^{(b)} + L_1^{(b)} L_0^{(f)}}{L_0^{(f)} + L_0^{(b)}}, \quad (19)$$

and the total thermopower becomes

$$S = -\frac{L_1}{L_0} = -\frac{L_1^{(c)} - \frac{L_1^{(f)} L_0^{(b)} + L_1^{(b)} L_0^{(f)}}{L_0^{(f)} + L_0^{(b)}}}{L_0^{(c)} + \frac{L_0^{(f)} L_0^{(b)}}{L_0^{(f)} + L_0^{(b)}}}. \quad (20)$$

Again, these equations only come from the renormalization of the electric charge.

The Onsager coefficients of fermions and bosons are analyzed differently, due to the presence/absence of a Fermi surface. For the two fermion species, $\rho = c, f$, we can use the results of Ref. [43], as their assumptions apply to our model. These assumptions are that (i) the scattering rate (both elastic and inelastic) is momentum independent, and (ii) the self-energy is small compared to the

bare terms. We can write

$$L_0^{(\rho)} = \Phi_0^{(\rho)} \langle \tau_+(T, xT) \rangle + \frac{T}{Z(T)} \Phi_0^{(\rho)'} \langle x \tau_-(T, xT) \rangle, \quad (21)$$

$$L_1^{(\rho)} = \Phi_0^{(\rho)} \langle x \tau_-(T, xT) \rangle + \frac{T}{Z(T)} \Phi_0^{(\rho)'} \langle x^2 \tau_+(T, xT) \rangle. \quad (22)$$

where we have additionally assumed that the quasiparticle residue $Z(T, \omega)$ is energy-independent (in practice it indeed depends only weakly on the energy near the Fermi surface). Here, $\Phi_0 = \Phi(\varepsilon_F)$, $\Phi_0' = \Phi'(\varepsilon_F)$. The frequency-dependent scattering time $\tau(T, \omega) = \frac{1}{\Gamma_{\text{tot}}(T, \omega)}$ is divided into even and odd components: $\tau_{\pm}(T, \omega) \equiv \frac{1}{2}(\tau(T, \omega) \pm \tau(T, -\omega))$. The brackets notation is

$$\langle F(x) \rangle \equiv \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \frac{F(x)}{4 \cosh^2(\frac{x}{2})}. \quad (23)$$

In the case of the boson Onsager coefficients, due to the absence of a large scale $\varepsilon_F \gg T$, we cannot use Eqs. (22). However, due to the completely disordered nature of the interactions the scattering rate is \mathbf{k} -independent. We can therefore still use the expression for $\mathcal{T}(\omega)$ from Eq. (16).

A. Onsager coefficients

We are now in a position to compute the Onsager coefficients at the leading order in $1/N$ for the theory in Eq. (1). The elastic scattering components, Γ_{ρ} , are very important, as they set the temperature scales for high- and low-temperature asymptotic behavior. These crossover temperature scales, T_{ρ}^* , are defined by comparing the elastic and inelastic scattering components, and are implicitly given by the solution to

$$T_{\rho}^* = \frac{\Gamma_{\rho}}{\lambda_{\rho} \pi g(0, z(T_{\rho}^*))}. \quad (24)$$

Using temperature variables that are scaled with respect to the crossover temperatures, $\theta_{\rho} = T/T_{\rho}^*$, the individual Onsager coefficients for the fermions are summarily written as

$$L_n^{(\rho)} = \frac{\Phi_0^{(\rho)}}{\Gamma_{\rho}} \left[F_n^{(\rho)}(\theta_{\rho}) + \eta_{\rho} \theta_{\rho} \left(\frac{T_{\rho}^*}{\Gamma_{\rho}} + \frac{\log\left(\frac{\Lambda}{2\pi T}\right) - \text{Re} \psi\left(\frac{1}{2} + i\frac{z}{2\pi}\right)}{2\pi g_{\rho}(0, z(T_{\rho}^*))} \right) F_{n+1}^{(\rho)}(\theta_{\rho}) \right], \quad (25)$$

where $\eta_{\rho} = \Gamma_{\rho} \Phi_0^{(\rho)'} / \Phi_0^{(\rho)}$ is the ratio of the elastic scattering rates to the characteristic energy scales associated with the band-structure asymmetries, and

$$F_n^{(\rho)}(\theta_{\rho}) \equiv \left\langle \frac{x^n}{1 + \theta_{\rho} \frac{g_{\rho}(x, z)}{g_{\rho}(0, z(T_{\rho}^*))}} \right\rangle. \quad (26)$$

For the bosonic coefficients $L_n^{(b)}$ we need the boson transport function,

$$\Phi^{(b)}(\epsilon) = \int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^2} v_{\mathbf{k}}^2 \delta(\epsilon - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^{(b)}) = \frac{1}{\pi} (\epsilon - \Delta_b) \Theta(\epsilon - \Delta_b). \quad (27)$$

Inserting the spectral function computed from Eq. (4) into Eq. (15), the final expression is given by

$$L_n^{(b)} = \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \frac{x^n}{4 \sinh^2(\frac{x}{2})} \left(1 + \frac{(x-z) \left(\frac{\pi}{2} + \arctan \frac{x-z}{\gamma|x|} \right)}{\gamma|x|} \right), \quad (28)$$

where, as before, $x = \omega/T$ and $z = \Delta_b/T$. Since the temperature dependence of $z(T)$ is very weak for all but the smallest temperatures, the coefficients $L_n^{(b)}$ are largely temperature-independent in the temperature regimes that we investigate. Importantly, the boson spectral function does not contain an elastic scattering term, as the boson does not interact with the static impurities in the system.

B. Seebeck coefficient for the Kondo lattice

With all of the Onsager coefficients in hand, we can use Eq. (20) to model the Seebeck coefficient, S/T , across the Fermi-volume changing transition in heavy fermion compounds. For our model parameters that have not been specified in Sec. II, we choose the following. We take the elastic scattering rates for the two electron species to be small and equal to each other, $\Gamma_c = \Gamma_f = 0.02$. This is a good assumption, as heavy fermion compounds are usually very clean, and there is no reason to believe the elastic scattering rates will differ significantly between the itinerant and localized electrons. We set the Landau damping parameter to $\gamma = 0.05$ and the boson UV cutoff $\Lambda = 100$. As mentioned in Sec. II, we take the dispersion of the f -electrons to be quadratic $\epsilon_f(k) = \frac{k^2}{2m_f} - \mu_f$. The mass is chosen to be $m_f = 10m_c$, and the chemical potential is chosen to make the density of the two fermions approximately equal (motivated by stoichiometric considerations in the real material). These choices give $\nu_f = 3$, $\Phi_0^{(f)} = 0.047$, $\Phi_0^{(f)'} = 1/\pi$. Finally, the boson mass is chosen to be $m_b = 25 \approx 1.2(m_f + m_c)$ (as it should be $m_b \gtrsim m_c + m_f$). Inserting all of these necessary components, the resulting Seebeck coefficient is shown in Fig. 4. We can see that the Seebeck coefficient (i) does not seem to saturate to a constant for $T \rightarrow 0$ as expected for a Fermi liquid, (ii) is larger on the ‘large Fermi surface’ side of the transition and (iii) has qualitatively different behavior with T on the two sides of the transition.

In order to facilitate a qualitative comparison with experimental measurement, in Fig. 4b we show a plot of




Figure 4: (a) Seebeck coefficient for small temperatures and the parameter values quoted in the text of Sec. III B, on the two sides of the transition, $\Delta\kappa \lesssim 0$. We normalize the temperature axis by the crossover scale at criticality, $T_c^*(\Delta\kappa = 0)$. The Seebeck coefficient itself is multiplied by $T_c^*(\Delta\kappa = 0)e/k_B$, giving a dimensionless quantity. The product of the values on the x and y axes gives the thermopower in units of k_B/e , and is normally less than one in real materials. We can see in our theoretical modeling this holds as well. (b) The experimental value of S/T in CeRhIn₅, taken from Ref. [6]. Looking at the three values of pressure that are closest to the critical value (on either side of it), $P = 1.90$ GPa, 2.20 GPa, 2.30 GPa, all the qualitative features of the curves match up with those in (a).

S/T in CeRhIn₅ across the pressure-tuned Fermi-volume changing transition, taken directly from Ref. [6]. Focusing on the three curves closest to the transition, we can see that our theoretical predictions are qualitatively very similar to the experimental behavior. This is suggestive of the fact that the metallic state inside of the critical fan of the transition is indeed a “skewed” MFL [43].

C. Seebeck coefficient for the single band model

Using the alternative view of Eq. (1) as coming from the ancilla theory description of the single band transition, we can also make a comparison to thermopower measured in cuprates [3, 4]. For this, we modify the dispersion of the f electrons by making it identical to that of the c -electrons, as explained in Sec. II. The boson mass is taken to be $m_b = 5 \approx 1.3(m_f + m_c)$, and all other parameters are left the same as in Sec. III B. The resulting curves are shown in Fig. 5, next to a reproduction of the data from Ref. [4]. We can see that the behavior as a function of T and $\Delta\kappa$ again qualitatively

reproduces the behavior as a function of T and the doping value relative to the critical one. We take this as support for the pseudogap critical point being governed by a non-symmetry-breaking Fermi-volume-changing transition, in the critical fan of which there exists a “skewed” MFL state.

D. Small temperature expansion

To better understand the results of Figs. 4, 5, we analyze the thermopower analytically via a small temperature expansion, specifically $\theta_c \ll 1$ (this implies $\theta_f \ll 1$ for both parameter regimes analyzed above, since $\theta_f \ll \theta_c$ in the Kondo lattice case and $\theta_f \sim \theta_c$ in the single-band case). Here, we only expand the $F_n^{(\rho)}$ functions, i.e. we ignore the θ_ρ -dependence of $z(T)$, which is known to be at most logarithmic in the temperature regime of interest (temperatures above the crossover scale between the quantum and classical critical regimes). Keeping the parameters for the two fermion species distinct for the moment, and restoring k_B and e , we write the small θ_c expression for S as

$$\begin{aligned}
 S = & -\frac{k_B}{e} \frac{1}{\Phi_0^{(c)} + \frac{\Phi_0^{(f)} L_0^{(b)} \Gamma_c}{\Phi_0^{(f)} + L_0^{(b)} \Gamma_f}} \left[\theta_c \left(\frac{\pi^2}{3} \Gamma_c \Phi_0^{(c)} \left(\frac{T_c^*}{\Gamma_c} + \frac{\log(\frac{\Lambda}{2\pi T}) - \text{Re} \psi(\frac{1}{2} + i\frac{z}{2\pi})}{2\pi g_c(0, z(T_c^*))} \right) - c_-(T) \Phi_0^{(c)} \right) \right. \\
 & - \theta_c \frac{T_c^*}{T_f^*} \frac{L_0^{(b)} \Gamma_c}{\Phi_0^{(f)} + L_0^{(b)} \Gamma_f} \left(\frac{\pi^2}{3} \Gamma_f \Phi_0^{(f)} \left(\frac{T_f^*}{\Gamma_f} + \frac{\log(\frac{\Lambda}{2\pi T}) - \text{Re} \psi(\frac{1}{2} + i\frac{z}{2\pi})}{2\pi g_f(0, z(T_f^*))} \right) + c_-(T) \Phi_0^{(f)} \right) \\
 & \left. - \frac{\Phi_0^{(f)} L_1^{(b)} \Gamma_c}{\Phi_0^{(f)} + L_0^{(b)} \Gamma_f} \right] + \mathcal{O}(\theta_c^2), \quad (29)
 \end{aligned}$$




Figure 5: (a) Seebeck coefficient for small temperatures and the parameter values quoted in the text of Sec. III C, on the two sides of the transition, $\Delta\kappa \lesseqgtr 0$. The axes are normalized as in Fig. 4a. As for the parameters modeling the heavy-femrion compounds, the numerical value of thermopower behaves as expected (cf. the caption of Fig. 4). (b) The experimental value of the in-plane Seebeck coefficient in $\text{La}_{1.6-x}\text{Nd}_{0.4}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4$ on both sides of the pseudogap critical point doping value, reproduced from Ref. [4] with permission from the authors. The qualitative features of the curves match up with those in (a).

where

$$c_-(T) \equiv \left\langle x \frac{g_c(x, z)}{g_c(0, z(T_c^*))} \right\rangle = - \left\langle x \frac{g_f(x, z)}{g_f(0, z(T_f^*))} \right\rangle. \quad (30)$$

To make further progress, we use the fact that the elastic scattering rates are small, $\Gamma_c \ll 1, \Gamma_f \ll 1$ (we do not rely on their approximate equality). This, in conjunction with the fact that $T_c^* \leq T_f^*$ and $L_n^{(b)} \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$ (not shown), implies that we can focus on the first term in Eq. (29) for a large temperature window. Therefore, in the low-intermediate temperature range, the thermopower can be estimated as coming exclusively from the c -electrons, which by themselves already form a “skewed” MFL,

$$S \approx - \frac{k_B}{e} \theta_c \left[\frac{\pi^2}{3} \eta_c \left(\frac{T_c^*}{\Gamma_c} + \frac{\log\left(\frac{\Lambda}{2\pi T}\right) - \text{Re} \psi\left(\frac{1}{2} + i \frac{z}{2\pi}\right)}{2\pi g_c(0, z(T_c^*))} \right) - c_-(T) \right]. \quad (31)$$

The terms in round parentheses multiplying η_c are positive and therefore drive S to be of the same sign as that of the free theory, i.e. $\text{sgn}(S) = -\text{sgn}(\eta_c)$. The coefficient $c_-(T)$ counteracts this effect, and over a large low-temperature range changes the sign of S [43]. However, $c_-(T)$ itself has some non-trivial T -dependence, which depends crucially on the sign of $\Delta\kappa$. To illustrate this, we plot $c_-(T)$ for various values of $\Delta\kappa$ using the same model parameters as in Sec. III C in Fig. 6. For all values of $\Delta\kappa$, $c_-(T)$ is roughly constant and $\sim \mathcal{O}(1)$ for




Figure 6: Behavior of $c_-(T)$ versus $\theta_c = T/T_c^*(0)$ for various $\Delta\kappa$. The parameter values are taken from Sec. III C. The inset is the same plot, albeit with a logarithmic scale for the temperature axis, in order to illustrate the asymptotic behavior at the smallest θ_c .

all but the smallest temperatures. Below $\theta_c \approx 0.5$, $c_-(T)$ vanishes super-logarithmically for $\Delta\kappa < 0$, while growing (slightly) sub-logarithmically for $\Delta\kappa \geq 0$. This explains the behavior of S/T in this low-intermediate temperature range, as its sign is determined by $c_-(T)$. While $c_-(T)$ is roughly constant $S/T > 0$ and changes very slowly, eventually decaying to $S/T < 0$ at larger temperatures. At lower temperatures, for $\Delta\kappa \geq 0$, the sub-logarithmic increase in $c_-(T)$ will counteract the logarithm coming from the MFL quasiparticle weight down to a critical temperature, after which the logarithmic part will take over and restore $\text{sgn}(S) \rightarrow -\text{sgn}(\eta_c)$. However, for $\Delta\kappa < 0$, $c_-(T)$ drops to zero, and this sign restoration occurs at a much larger T . Therefore, for all values

of $\Delta\kappa$ the form of S/T at ultra-low temperatures is still logarithmic, $S/T \sim -\frac{1}{T_c^*} \frac{\pi}{6} \eta_c \log\left(\frac{\Lambda}{2\pi T}\right) / g_c(0, z(T_c^*))$, and satisfies $\text{sgn}(S) = -\text{sgn}(\eta_c)$ (as $g_c(0, z(T_c^*)) > 0$), as in the case studied in Ref. [43].

IV. DISCUSSION

In this work, we have computed the thermopower in a Kondo lattice model across the Fermi-volume-changing quantum phase transition, using a controlled large- N approach. Our results show that the thermopower is large, and its behavior across the transition is not symmetric, and the side with the larger Fermi surface has an enhanced Seebeck coefficient, whose temperature-dependence is also non-trivial due to the itinerant electrons being a marginal Fermi-liquid. Furthermore, the side with the smaller Fermi surface has a non-monotonic temperature dependence in the low-intermediate temperature range. Comparing our results to those measured in the heavy fermion compound CeRhIn_5 in Ref. [6] gives a good qualitative match to the experimental data.

Symmetry-breaking transitions do not have the $-i\omega$ term in the critical boson propagator in (4) [69], and so their thermopower is quite weak, and mostly symmetric. In contrast, the asymmetric thermopower signal in the “skewed MFL” we have described here is as large as that in the non-particle-symmetric complex SYK model [59–68] and the model of Georges and Mravlje [43].

Another important point concerns the origin of the asymmetrical behavior in Fig. 4 and the downturn of S/T at small values of temperature. In this work we investigated the behavior inside the “quantum critical fan” only. Therefore, the non-monotonicity is not related to the crossover temperature of this quantum critical region, as such a scale is much lower than our smallest temperatures. This is in contrast to Ref. [42], where a somewhat similar behavior was argued to exist precisely due to this crossover scale.

Heavy fermion compounds typically have more than the two low-energy bands mentioned in this work, so it may seem strange to not take them into account. In particular, the various elastic scattering rates will determine the sequence of temperature windows where the thermopower is dominated by some bands and not others. However, near the Fermi-volume-changing transition, only one of the itinerant bands hybridizes with the localized f electrons, and only that band will get renormalized into a “skewed” MFL, while the others remain Fermi-liquid-like. This implies [43] that at low temperatures the main contribution to the Seebeck coefficient will come from this band only, and our results should still hold.

Interpreting the same model as coming from the ancilla theory of a Fermi-volume changing transition in a single-band model, we also make a comparison to recent experimental results on the thermopower in the cuprate $\text{La}_{1.6-x}\text{Nd}_{0.4}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4$ [3, 4]. Our results again quali-

tatively match the experimental data in a large temperature window, and reproduce the effect of a larger thermopower on the side of the smaller Fermi surface (pseudogap side of the critical point p^*). We regard this match as significant support for the existence of an underlying non-symmetry-breaking Fermi-volume-changing transition in the cuprates for the onset of the pseudogap at intermediate temperatures.

Another observation that adds support to this idea is the behavior of the Hall coefficient R_H across p^* . Experiments [24] show that R_H drops when going from $p > p^*$ to $p < p^*$. This is consistent with p^* being a Fermi-volume-changing transition, as the carrier density (responsible for Hall transport) is proportional to the Fermi volume. In fact, the behavior of R_H as a function of p and T bears a remarkable resemblance to the corresponding behavior of S/T [3, 4], suggesting a similar mechanism for the two.

In comparing to the observations in the cuprates in Fig. 5a, we have cut off the smallest temperature dependence, in order to illustrate the match between Figs. 5a and 5b in the rest of the temperature window. Lower-temperature behavior would eventually show a similar non-monotonicity as in Fig. 4a, which is absent in the experimental measurements. Our interpretation of this is that, at a low enough temperature scale, the blue curve in 5b (large Fermi surface) will eventually reach a maximum and exhibit a (super-logarithmic) downturn. This can be viewed as a prediction of our theory.

One unrealistic simplification our theory makes is that the interaction between the electrons and the Higgs field is purely random in space, $g'(r)$. A much more reasonable assumption is that the random part is subdominant to a translationally invariant piece, $g + g'(r)$ with $g \gg g'$. The inclusion of g will complicate the calculations in this paper, but we suspect it will not affect the low-temperature thermoelectric transport properties, as $g'(r)$ was argued to be most relevant for low-temperature electrical transport. However, a confirmation of this assumption from an explicit calculation with both couplings is highly desired.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Antoine Georges for insightful comments and explaining the results of Ref. [43]. We thank Ehud Altman, Gael Grissonnanche, and Louis Taillefer for useful discussions. We thank the authors of Ref. [4] for providing us with the data for Fig. 5b, and the authors of Ref. [6] for permission to reproduce Fig. 4b. This research was supported by the U.S. National Science Foundation grant No. DMR-2245246, by the Harvard Quantum Initiative Postdoctoral Fellowship in Science and Engineering, and by the Simons Collaboration on Ultra-Quantum Matter which is a grant from the Simons Foundation (651440, S. S.). The Flatiron Institute is a division of the Simons Foundation.

Appendix A: Ancilla theory of single-band model

The ancilla theory of Ref. [27] was outlined in Fig. 2. The degrees of freedom are the physical electrons c_α in the top layer, and two layers of ancilla spins, \mathbf{S}_1 and \mathbf{S}_2 in the bottom two layers. Eliminating these spin layers by a canonical (*i.e.* Schrieffer-Wolff type) transformation leads to a Hubbard-type single band Hamiltonian for the electrons in the top layer. This canonical transformation can be made precise at large J_\perp when we obtain only the Hubbard interaction [70]

$$U = \frac{3J_K^2}{8J_\perp} + \frac{3J_K^3}{16J_\perp^2} + \mathcal{O}(1/J_\perp^3). \quad (\text{A1})$$

We begin by recalling here the nature of the effective Hamiltonian within the FL* phase. The bottom layer of the \mathbf{S}_2 spins is assumed to form a spin liquid with fractionalization and no broken symmetry. An important advantage of the ancilla formulation is that this could be any spin liquid, and not just that associated with a spinon Fermi surface (which was assumed for the f_σ spinons in (1)). In mean-field theory, this \mathbf{S}_2 layer is decoupled from the top two-layers. For the intermediate \mathbf{S}_1 layer, we express the spin degrees of freedom in terms of a fractionalized fermion g_a , as indicated in Fig. 2. The index a is *not* a physical spin index, but that obtained by transforming to a rotating reference frame in spin space [27, 29, 37]. Consequently, g_a is subject to $\text{SU}(2) \times \text{U}(1)$ gauge transformations [12, 27, 71]:

$$g_a \rightarrow U_{ab} g_b \quad , \quad g_a \rightarrow e^{i\theta} g_a. \quad (\text{A2})$$

As in (1), we also have a hybridization Higgs boson $\Phi_{\sigma a}$ replacing the b boson. This boson couples the top two-layers by a Yukawa coupling, similar to H_{int} in (1):

$$H_{\text{int}} \sim c_\sigma^\dagger \Phi_{\sigma a} g_a \quad (\text{A3})$$

The gauge transformation in (A2) implies corresponding gauge transformations for $\Phi_{\sigma a}$:

$$\Phi_{\sigma a} \rightarrow \Phi_{\sigma b} U_{ba}^\dagger \quad , \quad \Phi_{\sigma a} \rightarrow e^{-i\theta} \Phi_{\sigma a}. \quad (\text{A4})$$

The remaining Hamiltonian for c_σ , g_a , $\Phi_{\sigma a}$ is similar to the corresponding Hamiltonian for c_σ , f_σ , and b in (1) for the Kondo lattice. So the main difference between the Kondo lattice case and the single-band case theories for FL* is that the $\text{U}(1)$ gauge invariance of (1) has been replaced here by the $\text{SU}(2) \times \text{U}(1)$ gauge invariances in (A2) and (A4). At the mean-field level, we assume an ansatz for the boson $\Phi_{\sigma a} \sim \Phi \delta_{\sigma a}$ [27], and then the ancilla theory is identical to the Kondo lattice theory in (1).

In principle, we do have to also account for the coupling between the above Kondo lattice Hamiltonian for the top two layers, and the spin liquid layer. Within the FL* phase, this can be investigated perturbatively in J_\perp , as was examined in Ref. [72] (this paper also made connections to measured photoemission spectra in the cuprates). Alternatively, we can employ variational wavefunctions involving a projection onto rung singlets of the $\mathbf{S}_{1,2}$ layers. This was the approach employed in Refs. [73, 74], which also compared with observations on ultracold atomic systems.

For the transition from FL* to FL, it was argued in Refs. [27, 75] that we need only account for the fluctuations of the $\Phi_{\sigma a}$ and associated $\text{SU}(2) \times \text{U}(1)$ fluctuations. At the gaussian level, examined for the Kondo lattice in the present paper, there are no significant differences with the ancilla case.

We can also consider confinement transitions out of the FL* into low temperature superconducting or charge-ordered phases. For these, it is essential to include the coupling to the bottom \mathbf{S}_2 layer. These transitions have been examined recently in Refs. [76–80].

Appendix B: Material properties of Nd-LSCO

Here we give details of the band structure of $\text{La}_{1.6-x}\text{Nd}_{0.4}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4$ as measured from experiments. The hopping parameters we used for Eq. (3) are taken from Ref. [4] and are given by $t = 160 \text{ meV}$, $t' = -0.1364t$, $t'' = 0.0682t$, $\mu = -0.8243t$. Working in units of t (*i.e.* setting $t = 1$), this gives the following values for the (spinless) density of states, transport function (for both spin species) and its derivative, all measured at the Fermi level: $\nu_c = 0.3054$, $\Phi_0^{(c)} = 1.064$, $\Phi_0'^{(c)} = 0.83$.

Appendix C: Self-energies

Here we discuss the computation of the self-energy for the conduction electrons. The calculation for the f-electrons is nearly identical. The entire self-energy is given by

$$\Sigma_c(i\omega_n, T) = g^2 T \sum_{i\omega'_m} G_f(i\omega'_m + i\omega_n) G_b(-i\omega'_m) = -\frac{i}{2} \nu_f g^2 \frac{m_b}{2\pi} T \sum_{i\omega'_m} \text{sgn}(\omega'_m + \omega_n) \log\left(\frac{\Lambda}{i\omega'_m + \gamma|\omega'_m| + \Delta_b}\right), \quad (\text{C1})$$

where $\omega_n = 2\pi T(n + 1/2)$, $\omega'_m = 2\pi Tm$ are fermionic and bosonic Matsubara frequencies, respectively. We divide the Matsubara summation into parts, and, following some regrouping, the entire expression can be written as the sum of two terms

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_c(i\omega_n, T) = & -\frac{i}{2} \nu_f g^2 \frac{m_b}{2\pi} T \left[\sum_{m=-|n|+\Theta(-n-1/2)}^{|n|-\Theta(-n-1/2)} \text{sgn}(2n + 2m + 1) \log\left(\frac{\Lambda}{i2\pi mT + \gamma2\pi T|m| + \Delta_b}\right) \right. \\ & \left. + \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{m=|n|+\Theta(n+1/2)}^M \log\left(\frac{\Lambda}{i2\pi mT + \gamma2\pi T|m| + \Delta_b}\right) - \log\left(\frac{\Lambda}{-i2\pi mT + \gamma2\pi T|m| + \Delta_b}\right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C2})$$

Here $\Theta(x)$ is the Heaviside step function. Both summations can be performed in Mathematica. After rewriting in terms of ω_n and $z = \Delta_b/T$, the result is

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_c(i\omega_n, T) = & -i\gamma \frac{Tm_b}{2\nu_c} \left[\text{sgn} \omega_n \left(\frac{|\omega_n|}{\pi T} \log\left(\frac{\Lambda}{2\pi T\sqrt{1+\gamma^2}}\right) - \log\left(\frac{z}{2\pi\sqrt{1+\gamma^2}}\right) - \log\left|\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{z(\gamma+i)}{2\pi(1+\gamma^2)} - \frac{|\omega_n|}{2\pi T}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{z(\gamma+i)}{2\pi(1+\gamma^2)}\right)}\right|^2 \right) \right. \\ & \left. + i \frac{|\omega_n|}{\pi T} \text{arccot}(\gamma) + \log\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{z(\gamma-i)}{2\pi(1+\gamma^2)} + \frac{|\omega_n|}{2\pi T}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{z(\gamma+i)}{2\pi(1+\gamma^2)} + \frac{|\omega_n|}{2\pi T}\right)} + \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ i(2M+1) \text{arccot}(\gamma) + \log\frac{\Gamma\left(M+1 + \frac{z(\gamma-i)}{2\pi(1+\gamma^2)}\right)}{\Gamma\left(M+1 + \frac{z(\gamma+i)}{2\pi(1+\gamma^2)}\right)} \right\} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C3})$$

The first line (everything proportional to $\text{sgn}(\omega_n)$) comes from the first summation, while everything else is the result of the second summation. The last term inside of the curly brackets depends on the cutoff parameter M , and is independent of ω_n . It can easily be checked that its contribution to Σ_c is purely real, and therefore can be absorbed into the chemical potential. Analytically continuing to real frequency gives

$$\Sigma_{c,R}(x, T) = \gamma \frac{Tm_b}{2\nu_c} \left[-\frac{x}{\pi} \log\left(\frac{\Lambda}{2\pi T\sqrt{1+\gamma^2}}\right) - i\frac{x}{\pi} \text{arccot}(\gamma) - i \log\left(\frac{\left|\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{z(\gamma+i)}{2\pi(1+\gamma^2)}\right)\right|^2}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{z(\gamma+i)}{2\pi(1+\gamma^2)} - \frac{ix}{2\pi}\right)^2} \frac{2\pi\sqrt{1+\gamma^2}}{z}\right) \right] + C_c(T), \quad (\text{C4})$$

where $x = \omega/T$, $z = \Delta_b/T$, and $C_c(T)$ is the frequency-independent real term discussed above. As we are only interested in the case when $\gamma \ll 1$ (c.f. Section II A), this expression can be significantly simplified, which results in Eq. (6). Notably, neglecting terms these terms (γ and $z(T)\gamma$) for the values of γ we use in the main text is valid, as can be explicitly checked once the self-consistent expression for $z(T)$ (Eq. (6)) is solved. We also note that taking the $T = 0$ limit of this expression matches the same $T = 0$ expression computed in Ref. [44].

Appendix D: Vertex renormalizations

Here we discuss the renormalization of the two types of vertices: electrical and thermal. We show how the thermal vertex renormalizations cancel out.

The f -electrons and boson share an emergent $U(1)$ charge, which is distributed between them. Once this emergent gauge field is integrated out, it leads to an intertwined renormalization of the current vertices for both species. Specifically, the renormalized currents are given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} J_R^{(f)} \\ J_{Q,R}^{(f)} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -\Pi_b(\Pi_f + \Pi_b)^{-1} & 0 \\ -(\tilde{\Pi}_f - \tilde{\Pi}_b)(\Pi_f + \Pi_b)^{-1} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} J^{(f)} \\ J_Q^{(f)} \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{D1})$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} J_R^{(b)} \\ J_{Q,R}^{(b)} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -\Pi_f(\Pi_f + \Pi_b)^{-1} & 0 \\ (\tilde{\Pi}_f - \tilde{\Pi}_b)(\Pi_f + \Pi_b)^{-1} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} J^{(b)} \\ J_Q^{(b)} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{D2})$$

Here, the Π_λ are electrical polarization bubbles, and $\tilde{\Pi}_\lambda$ are thermoelectric bubbles.

The thermoelectric correlations function of the renormalized currents are then given by

$$\langle J_{Q,R}^{(f)} J_R^{(f)} \rangle = - \left(\tilde{\Pi}_f - (\tilde{\Pi}_f - \tilde{\Pi}_b)(\Pi_f + \Pi_b)^{-1} \Pi_f \right) \Pi_b (\Pi_f + \Pi_b)^{-1} \quad (\text{D3})$$

$$\langle J_{Q,R}^{(b)} J_R^{(b)} \rangle = - \left(\tilde{\Pi}_b + (\tilde{\Pi}_f - \tilde{\Pi}_b)(\Pi_f + \Pi_b)^{-1} \Pi_b \right) \Pi_f (\Pi_f + \Pi_b)^{-1} \quad (\text{D4})$$

Summing these up, the two large contributions (coming from the renormalization of $J_Q^{(\lambda)}$) cancel out, leading to

$$\langle J_{Q,R}^{(f)} J_R^{(f)} \rangle + \langle J_{Q,R}^{(b)} J_R^{(b)} \rangle = - \left(\tilde{\Pi}_f \Pi_b + \tilde{\Pi}_b \Pi_f \right) (\Pi_f + \Pi_b)^{-1}, \quad (\text{D5})$$

which gives the expression for L_1 in Eq. (19).

-
- [1] S. Hartmann, N. Oeschler, C. Krellner, C. Geibel, S. Paschen, and F. Steglich, Thermopower Evidence for an Abrupt Fermi Surface Change at the Quantum Critical Point of YbRh₂Si₂, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 096401 (2010).
- [2] Y. Machida, K. Tomokuni, C. Ogura, K. Izawa, K. Kuga, S. Nakatsuji, G. Lapertot, G. Knebel, J. P. Brison, and J. Flouquet, Thermoelectric Response Near a Quantum Critical Point of β -YbAlB₄ and YbRh₂Si₂: A Comparative Study, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 156405 (2012), arXiv:1202.2753 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [3] C. Collignon, A. Ataei, A. Gourgout, S. Badoux, M. Lizaire, A. Legros, S. Licciardello, S. Wiedmann, J. Q. Yan, J. S. Zhou, Q. Ma, B. D. Gaulin, N. Doiron-Leyraud, and L. Taillefer, Thermopower across the phase diagram of the cuprate La_{1.6-x}Nd_{0.4}Sr_xCuO₄: Signatures of the pseudogap and charge density wave phases, *Phys. Rev. B* **103**, 155102 (2021), arXiv:2011.14927 [cond-mat.supr-con].
- [4] A. Gourgout, G. Grissonnanche, F. Laliberté, A. Ataei, L. Chen, S. Verret, J.-S. Zhou, J. Mravlje, A. Georges, N. Doiron-Leyraud, and L. Taillefer, Seebeck Coefficient in a Cuprate Superconductor: Particle-Hole Asymmetry in the Strange Metal Phase and Fermi Surface Transformation in the Pseudogap Phase, *Phys. Rev. X* **12**, 011037 (2022).
- [5] K. Wakamatsu, Y. Suzuki, T. Fujii, K. Miyagawa, H. Taniguchi, and K. Kanoda, Thermoelectric signature of quantum critical phase in a doped spin-liquid candidate, *Nature Communications* **14**, 3679 (2023), arXiv:2201.10714 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [6] Z.-Y. Cao, H. Wang, C.-K. Park, T. B. Park, H. Jang, S. Seo, S.-I. Kim, and T. Park, Thermoelectric signature of quantum criticality in the heavy-fermion superconductor CeRhIn₅, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2408.13604 (2024), arXiv:2408.13604 [cond-mat.supr-con].
- [7] T. Senthil, S. Sachdev, and M. Vojta, Fractionalized Fermi Liquids, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 216403 (2003), cond-mat/0209144.
- [8] T. Senthil, M. Vojta, and S. Sachdev, Weak magnetism and non-Fermi liquids near heavy-fermion critical points, *Phys. Rev. B* **69**, 035111 (2004), arXiv:cond-mat/0305193 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [9] N. Andrei and P. Coleman, Cooper instability in the presence of a spin liquid, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **62**, 595 (1989).
- [10] A. Paramekanti and A. Vishwanath, Extending Luttinger's theorem to \mathbb{Z}_2 fractionalized phases of matter, *Phys. Rev. B* **70**, 245118 (2004), cond-mat/0406619.
- [11] P. Bonderson, M. Cheng, K. Patel, and E. Plamadeala, Topological Enrichment of Luttinger's Theorem, arXiv e-prints (2016), arXiv:1601.07902 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [12] S. Sachdev, *Quantum Phases of Matter* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U. K., 2023).
- [13] M. Oshikawa, Topological Approach to Luttinger's Theorem and the Fermi Surface of a Kondo Lattice, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 3370 (2000), cond-mat/0002392.
- [14] S. Sachdev, Strange metals and black holes: insights from the Sachdev-Ye-Kitaev model, Oxford Research Encyclopedia in Physics 10.1093/acrefore/9780190871994.013.48 (2023), arXiv:2305.01001 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [15] P. Coleman, C. Pépin, Q. Si, and R. Ramazashvili, How do Fermi liquids get heavy and die?, *Journal of Physics Condensed Matter* **13**, R723 (2001), arXiv:cond-mat/0105006 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [16] H. Shishido, R. Settai, H. Harima, and Y. Ōnuki, A Drastic Change of the Fermi Surface at a Critical Pressure in CeRhIn₅: dHvA Study under Pressure, *Journal of the Physical Society of Japan* **74**, 1103 (2005).
- [17] S. Friedemann, T. Westerkamp, M. Brando, N. Oeschler, S. Wirth, P. Gegenwart, C. Krellner, C. Geibel, and F. Steglich, Detaching the antiferromagnetic quantum critical point from the Fermi-surface reconstruction in YbRh₂Si₂, *Nature Physics* **5**, 465 (2009).
- [18] T. Park, F. Ronning, H. Q. Yuan, M. B. Salamon, R. Movshovich, J. L. Sarrao, and J. D. Thompson, Hidden magnetism and quantum criticality in the heavy fermion superconductor CeRhIn₅, *Nature (London)* **440**, 65 (2006), arXiv:cond-mat/0603090 [cond-mat.supr-con].
- [19] N. Maksimovic, D. H. Eilbott, T. Cookmeyer, F. Wan, J. Ruzs, V. Nagarajan, S. C. Haley, E. Maniv, A. Gong, S. Faubel, I. M. Hayes, A. Bangura, J. Singleton, J. C. Palmstrom, L. Winter, R. McDonald, S. Jang, P. Ai, Y. Lin, S. Ciocys, J. Gobbo, Y. Werman, P. M. Oppeneer, E. Altman, A. Lanzara, and J. G. Analytis, Evidence for a delocalization quantum phase transition without symmetry breaking in CeCoIn₅, *Science* **375**, 76 (2022).
- [20] H. Wang, T. B. Park, J. Kim, H. Jang, E. D. Bauer, J. D. Thompson, and T. Park, Evidence for charge delocalization crossover in the quantum critical superconductor CeRhIn₅, *Nature Communications* **14**, 7341 (2023),

- arXiv:2311.08928 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [21] Y. He, Y. Yin, M. Zech, A. Soumyanarayanan, M. M. Yee, T. Williams, M. C. Boyer, K. Chatterjee, W. D. Wise, I. Zeljkovic, T. Kondo, T. Takeuchi, H. Ikuta, P. Mistark, R. S. Markiewicz, A. Bansil, S. Sachdev, E. W. Hudson, and J. E. Hoffman, Fermi Surface and Pseudogap Evolution in a Cuprate Superconductor, *Science* **344**, 608 (2014), arXiv:1305.2778 [cond-mat.supr-con].
- [22] K. Fujita, C. K. Kim, I. Lee, J. Lee, M. H. Hamidian, I. A. Firmo, S. Mukhopadhyay, H. Eisaki, S. Uchida, M. J. Lawler, E. A. Kim, and J. C. Davis, Simultaneous Transitions in Cuprate Momentum-Space Topology and Electronic Symmetry Breaking, *Science* **344**, 612 (2014), arXiv:1403.7788 [cond-mat.supr-con].
- [23] S. Badoux, W. Tabis, F. Laliberté, G. Grissonnanche, B. Vignolle, D. Vignolles, J. Béard, D. A. Bonn, W. N. Hardy, R. Liang, N. Doiron-Leyraud, L. Taillefer, and C. Proust, Change of carrier density at the pseudogap critical point of a cuprate superconductor, *Nature (London)* **531**, 210 (2016), arXiv:1511.08162 [cond-mat.supr-con].
- [24] C. Collignon, S. Badoux, S. A. A. Afshar, B. Michon, F. Laliberté, O. Cyr-Choinière, J. S. Zhou, S. Licciardello, S. Wiedmann, N. Doiron-Leyraud, and L. Taillefer, Fermi-surface transformation across the pseudogap critical point of the cuprate superconductor $\text{La}_{1.6-x}\text{Nd}_{0.4}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4$, *Phys. Rev. B* **95**, 224517 (2017), arXiv:1607.05693 [cond-mat.supr-con].
- [25] Y. Fang, G. Grissonnanche, A. Legros, S. Verret, F. Laliberté, C. Collignon, A. Ataei, M. Dion, J. Zhou, D. Graf, M. J. Lawler, P. A. Goddard, L. Taillefer, and B. J. Ramshaw, Fermi surface transformation at the pseudogap critical point of a cuprate superconductor, *Nature Physics* **18**, 558 (2022).
- [26] S. Sachdev, H. D. Scammell, M. S. Scheurer, and G. Tarnopolsky, Gauge theory for the cuprates near optimal doping, *Phys. Rev. B* **99**, 054516 (2019), arXiv:1811.04930 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [27] Y.-H. Zhang and S. Sachdev, From the pseudogap metal to the Fermi liquid using ancilla qubits, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **2**, 023172 (2020).
- [28] C. Wang, A. Nahum, M. A. Metlitski, C. Xu, and T. Senthil, Deconfined quantum critical points: symmetries and dualities, *Phys. Rev. X* **7**, 031051 (2017), arXiv:1703.02426 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [29] S. Sachdev, M. A. Metlitski, Y. Qi, and C. Xu, Fluctuating spin density waves in metals, *Phys. Rev. B* **80**, 155129 (2009), arXiv:0907.3732 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [30] D. Chowdhury and S. Sachdev, Higgs criticality in a two-dimensional metal, *Phys. Rev. B* **91**, 115123 (2015), arXiv:1412.1086 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [31] D. Chowdhury and S. Sachdev, The Enigma of the Pseudogap Phase of the Cuprate Superconductors, in *Quantum criticality in condensed matter*, 50th Karpacz Winter School of Theoretical Physics, edited by J. Jędrzejewski (World Scientific, 2015) pp. 1–43, arXiv:1501.00002 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [32] S. Chatterjee, S. Sachdev, and M. S. Scheurer, Intertwining Topological Order and Broken Symmetry in a Theory of Fluctuating Spin-Density Waves, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 227002 (2017), arXiv:1705.06289 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [33] W. Wu, M. S. Scheurer, S. Chatterjee, S. Sachdev, A. Georges, and M. Ferrero, Pseudogap and Fermi Surface Topology in the Two-Dimensional Hubbard Model, *Phys. Rev. X* **8**, 021048 (2018), arXiv:1707.06602 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [34] M. S. Scheurer, S. Chatterjee, W. Wu, M. Ferrero, A. Georges, and S. Sachdev, Topological order in the pseudogap metal, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.* **115**, E3665 (2018), arXiv:1711.09925 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [35] S. Sachdev, Topological order, emergent gauge fields, and Fermi surface reconstruction, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **82**, 014001 (2019), arXiv:1801.01125 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [36] W. Wu, M. S. Scheurer, M. Ferrero, and A. Georges, Effect of van Hove singularities in the onset of pseudogap states in Mott insulators, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **2**, 033067 (2020), arXiv:2001.00019 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [37] P. M. Bonetti and W. Metzner, $\text{SU}(2)$ gauge theory of the pseudogap phase in the two-dimensional Hubbard model, *Phys. Rev. B* **106**, 205152 (2022), arXiv:2207.00829 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [38] R. Scholle, P. M. Bonetti, D. Vildardi, and W. Metzner, Comprehensive mean-field analysis of magnetic and charge orders in the two-dimensional Hubbard model, *Phys. Rev. B* **108**, 035139 (2023), arXiv:2303.15358 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [39] J. He, C. R. Rotundu, M. S. Scheurer, Y. He, M. Hashimoto, K.-J. Xu, Y. Wang, E. W. Huang, T. Jia, S. Chen, B. Moritz, D. Lu, Y. S. Lee, T. P. Devereaux, and Z.-x. Shen, Fermi surface reconstruction in electron-doped cuprates without antiferromagnetic long-range order, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.* **116**, 3449 (2019), arXiv:1811.04992 [cond-mat.supr-con].
- [40] I. Paul and G. Kotliar, Thermoelectric behavior near the magnetic quantum critical point, *Phys. Rev. B* **64**, 184414 (2001), arXiv:cond-mat/0104368 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [41] K. Haule and G. Kotliar, Thermoelectrics Near the Mott Localization—Delocalization Transition, in *Properties and Applications of Thermoelectric Materials*, edited by V. Zlatić and A. C. Hewson (2009) p. 119.
- [42] K.-S. Kim and C. Pépin, Thermopower as a signature of quantum criticality in heavy fermions, *Phys. Rev. B* **81**, 205108 (2010), arXiv:1002.2612 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [43] A. Georges and J. Mravlje, Skewed non-Fermi liquids and the Seebeck effect, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **3**, 043132 (2021).
- [44] E. E. Aldape, T. Cookmeyer, A. A. Patel, and E. Altman, Solvable theory of a strange metal at the breakdown of a heavy Fermi liquid, *Phys. Rev. B* **105**, 235111 (2022).
- [45] A. A. Patel, H. Guo, I. Esterlis, and S. Sachdev, Universal theory of strange metals from spatially random interactions, *Science* **381**, 790 (2022), arXiv:2203.04990 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [46] A. A. Patel, P. Lunts, and S. Sachdev, Localization of overdamped bosonic modes and transport in strange metals, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.* **121**, e2402052121 (2024), arXiv:2312.06751 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [47] C. Li, D. Valentini, A. A. Patel, H. Guo, J. Schmalian, S. Sachdev, and I. Esterlis, Strange metal and superconductor in the two-dimensional Yukawa-Sachdev-Ye-Kitaev model, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **133**, 186502 (2024), arXiv:2406.07608 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [48] A. Hardy, O. Parcollet, A. Georges, and A. A. Patel, Enhanced strange metallicity due to Coulomb repulsion, arXiv e-prints (2024), arXiv:2407.21102 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [49] A. Patel, P. Lunts, and M. Albergo, Strange metals and planckian transport in a gapless phase from spatially

- random interactions, [arXiv e-prints](#), [arXiv:2410.05365 \(2024\)](#), [arXiv:2410.05365 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [50] S. A. Hartnoll, P. K. Kovtun, M. Muller, and S. Sachdev, Theory of the Nernst effect near quantum phase transitions in condensed matter, and in dyonic black holes, *Phys. Rev. B* **76**, 144502 (2007), [arXiv:0706.3215 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [51] D. L. Maslov, V. I. Yudson, and A. V. Chubukov, Resistivity of a Non-Galilean-Invariant Fermi Liquid near Pomeranchuk Quantum Criticality, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 106403 (2011), [arXiv:1012.0069 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [52] S. A. Hartnoll, R. Mahajan, M. Punk, and S. Sachdev, Transport near the Ising-nematic quantum critical point of metals in two dimensions, *Phys. Rev. B* **89**, 155130 (2014), [arXiv:1401.7012 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [53] A. A. Patel and S. Sachdev, DC resistivity at the onset of spin density wave order in two-dimensional metals, *Phys. Rev. B* **90**, 165146 (2014), [arXiv:1408.6549 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [54] D. L. Maslov and A. V. Chubukov, Optical response of correlated electron systems, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **80**, 026503 (2017), [arXiv:1608.02514 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [55] H. Guo, A. A. Patel, I. Esterlis, and S. Sachdev, Large- N theory of critical Fermi surfaces. II. Conductivity, *Phys. Rev. B* **106**, 115151 (2022), [arXiv:2207.08841 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [56] Z. D. Shi, D. V. Else, H. Goldman, and T. Senthil, Loop current fluctuations and quantum critical transport, *SciPost Phys.* **14**, 113 (2023).
- [57] H. Guo, D. Valentinis, J. Schmalian, S. Sachdev, and A. A. Patel, Cyclotron resonance and quantum oscillations of critical Fermi surfaces, *Phys. Rev. B* **109**, 075162 (2024), [arXiv:2308.01956 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [58] O. Trovarelli, C. Geibel, S. Mederle, C. Langhammer, F. M. Grosche, P. Gegenwart, M. Lang, G. Sparn, and F. Steglich, YbRh₂Si₂: Pronounced Non-Fermi-Liquid Effects above a Low-Lying Magnetic Phase Transition, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 626 (2000).
- [59] S. Sachdev and J. Ye, Gapless spin-fluid ground state in a random quantum Heisenberg magnet, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 3339 (1993), [cond-mat/9212030](#).
- [60] O. Parcollet, A. Georges, G. Kotliar, and A. Sengupta, Overscreened multichannel SU(N) Kondo model: Large- N solution and conformal field theory, *Phys. Rev. B* **58**, 3794 (1998), [arXiv:cond-mat/9711192 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [61] O. Parcollet and A. Georges, Non-Fermi-liquid regime of a doped Mott insulator, *Phys. Rev. B* **59**, 5341 (1999), [arXiv:cond-mat/9806119 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [62] S. Sachdev, Bekenstein-Hawking Entropy and Strange Metals, *Phys. Rev. X* **5**, 041025 (2015), [arXiv:1506.05111 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [63] R. A. Davison, W. Fu, A. Georges, Y. Gu, K. Jensen, and S. Sachdev, Thermoelectric transport in disordered metals without quasiparticles: The Sachdev-Ye-Kitaev models and holography, *Phys. Rev. B* **95**, 155131 (2017), [arXiv:1612.00849 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [64] Y. Gu, A. Kitaev, S. Sachdev, and G. Tarnopolsky, Notes on the complex Sachdev-Ye-Kitaev model, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **02**, 157 (2020), [arXiv:1910.14099 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [65] A. Kruchkov, A. A. Patel, P. Kim, and S. Sachdev, Thermoelectric power of Sachdev-Ye-Kitaev islands: Probing Bekenstein-Hawking entropy in quantum matter experiments, *Phys. Rev. B* **101**, 205148 (2020), [arXiv:1912.02835 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [66] D. Rossini, G. M. Andolina, D. Rosa, M. Carrega, and M. Polini, Quantum advantage in the charging process of Sachdev-Ye-Kitaev batteries, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 236402 (2020), [arXiv:1912.07234 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [67] H. Shackleton, L. E. Anderson, P. Kim, and S. Sachdev, Conductance and thermopower fluctuations in interacting quantum dots, *Phys. Rev. B* **109**, 235109 (2024), [arXiv:2309.05741 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [68] L. E. Anderson, A. Laitinen, A. Zimmerman, T. Werkmeister, H. Shackleton, A. Kruchkov, T. Taniguchi, K. Watanabe, S. Sachdev, and P. Kim, Magneto-Thermoelectric Transport in Graphene Quantum Dot with Strong Correlations, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **132**, 246502 (2024), [arXiv:2401.08050 \[cond-mat.mes-hall\]](#).
- [69] S. Sachdev, *Quantum Phase Transitions* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1999).
- [70] A. Nikolaenko, M. Tikhonovskaya, S. Sachdev, and Y.-H. Zhang, Small to large Fermi surface transition in a single-band model using randomly coupled ancillas, *Phys. Rev. B* **103**, 235138 (2021), [arXiv:2103.05009 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [71] L. Zou and D. Chowdhury, Deconfined metallic quantum criticality: A U(2) gauge-theoretic approach, *Physical Review Research* **2**, 023344 (2020), [arXiv:2002.02972 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [72] E. Mascot, A. Nikolaenko, M. Tikhonovskaya, Y.-H. Zhang, D. K. Morr, and S. Sachdev, Electronic spectra with paramagnon fractionalization in the single-band Hubbard model, *Phys. Rev. B* **105**, 075146 (2022), [arXiv:2111.13703 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [73] H. Shackleton and S. Zhang, Emergent polaronic correlations in doped spin liquids, [arXiv e-prints](#) (2024), [arXiv:2408.02190 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [74] T. Müller, R. Thomale, S. Sachdev, and Y. Iqbal, Polaronic correlations from optimized ancilla wave functions for the Fermi-Hubbard model, [arXiv e-prints](#) (2024), [arXiv:2408.01492 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [75] Y.-H. Zhang and S. Sachdev, Deconfined criticality and ghost Fermi surfaces at the onset of antiferromagnetism in a metal, *Phys. Rev. B* **102**, 155124 (2020), [arXiv:2006.01140 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [76] M. Christos, Z.-X. Luo, H. Shackleton, Y.-H. Zhang, M. S. Scheurer, and S. Sachdev, A model of d -wave superconductivity, antiferromagnetism, and charge order on the square lattice, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science* **120**, e2302701120 (2023), [arXiv:2302.07885 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [77] M. Christos and S. Sachdev, Emergence of nodal Bogoliubov quasiparticles across the transition from the pseudogap metal to the d -wave superconductor, *npj Quantum Materials* **9**, 4 (2024), [arXiv:2308.03835 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [78] M. Christos, H. Shackleton, S. Sachdev, and Z.-X. Luo, Deconfined quantum criticality of nodal d -wave superconductivity, Néel order, and charge order on the square lattice at half-filling, *Physical Review Research* **6**, 033018 (2024), [arXiv:2402.09502 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [79] P. M. Bonetti, M. Christos, and S. Sachdev, Quantum oscillations in the hole-doped cuprates and the confinement of spinons, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **121**, e2418633121 (2024), [arXiv:2405.08817 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [80] J.-X. Zhang and S. Sachdev, Vortex structure in a d -wave superconductor obtained by a confinement transi-

tion from the pseudogap metal, *Phys. Rev. B* **110**, 235120 (2024), [arXiv:2406.12964](https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.12964) [cond-mat.str-el].