Universal low-density power laws of the dc conductivity and Hall constant in the self-consistent Born approximation

Giacomo Morpurgo, Christophe Berthod, and Thierry Giamarchi

Department of Quantum Matter Physics, University of Geneva, 1205 Geneva, Switzerland

(Dated: April 4, 2025)

The dc conductivity tensor of two-dimensional one-band metals with weak pointlike disorder and magnetic field is studied in the self-consistent Born approximation, with special emphasis on the regime of low carrier density. In this theory, the Kubo conductivity is a functional of the electron dispersion and local (momentum-independent) electron self-energy, which is itself a causal functional of the dispersion and disorder strength. We obtain exact closed expressions for the asymptotic low-density conductivities at zero temperature in the form of power laws of the density and disorder strength with universal exponents. The crossover to the semiclassical regime of high density is studied numerically, as well as the temperature dependence. Our model and results may be relevant to interpret linear magneto-transport experiments performed in the metallic regime of gated two-dimensional semiconductors.

I. INTRODUCTION

After the pioneering works on two-dimensional (2D) organic and conventional semiconductors in the 1980s [1, 2], the experimental research on field-effect doping has accelerated since the discovery of graphene [3], monolayer transition-metal dichalcogenides [4], and more recently moiré systems [5, 6], transforming our understanding of 2D materials and enabling new technologies. From a technological viewpoint, two of the most relevant quantities in 2D gated conductors are the carrier density, which is varied by applying the gate-voltage, and the carrier mobility, which depends on the intrinsic scattering mechanisms and the sample purity. While these two quantities govern the transport properties of the devices, none of them can be directly measured.

Two different methods are commonly used to estimate the carrier density. The first relies on the Hall constant being inversely proportional to the carrier density, as found in the classical Drude and semiclassical Boltzmann theories, while the second relies on modeling the device capacitance [7, 8]. Both approaches have limitations. The universality of the classical relation between the Hall constant and the carrier density has been repeatedly questioned [9–11]. On the other hand, modeling the capacitance with geometrical and quantum terms was shown to disregard contributions that are potentially important in ultrathin devices [12, 13]. Similar concerns have been raised regarding the estimation of the mobility [14], which is meant to be a density-independent measure of the scattering.

To uncover the exact relationship linking carrier density and scattering with the transport characteristics in regimes where the conventional rules are suspected to fail, in particular in the regime of low carrier density [11], one has to study rigorously the conductivity tensor and the Hall effect, which remains a hard problem to this date. The semiclassical transport theory [15] may be justified when the scattering rate is the smallest energy scale, making it unsuitable to study transport at vanishingly low carrier densities, where the smallest energy scale is the Fermi energy. On the other hand, the rigorous microscopic quantum theory [16–18] remains intractable in the thermodynamic limit, although interesting perturbative [19, 20] and nonperturbative [21, 22] results have been reported. For nearly half-filled bands, progress has been possible for Hubbard-like models using exact numerical techniques on small lattices [23–25] or approximate theories [26–32], as well as for quasi-one dimensional models [33–35] and ladders [36–38].

In comparison, the magneto-transport in the regime of low carrier density, which is accessible experimentally via field-effect doping of semiconductors or semimetals, has received little theoretical attention so far. This is understandable, as some of the approximations that enable analytical treatments of microscopic Hamiltonians at high density are no longer allowed, while among the numerical techniques, only those working in the thermodynamic limit have a chance to access this regime. An intermediate class of tractable theories, where both analytical and exact numerical results can be obtained at low density, is formed by the locally-correlated models, where the conductivity only depends on the dressed electron Green's function [27, 28, 39].

In the present work, we study one such locally-correlated model describing impurity scattering. At variance with previous studies dealing with impurity scattering [9, 10, 40-42], we define here a model that is meant to be local from the outset-by using pointlike impurities treated in the selfconsistent Born approximation-and we solve it without further approximation. We derive exact asymptotic results at low density and zero temperature, that we back up by accurate numerical calculations. Both for parabolic and cosine dispersions in two dimensions, we find that the conductivity and Hall constants are power laws of the density with universal exponents, $\sigma_{xx} \sim n^{2/3}$ and $R_{\rm H} \sim n^{-1/3}$, whereas the usual laws $\sigma_{xx} \sim n$ and $R_{\rm H} \sim n^{-1}$ are recovered at high density. Assuming that the change in gate voltage translates into the same change in chemical potential, a contact is established with the field-effect experiments. We show that the chemical potential follows a power law as well, $\mu - \varepsilon_0 \sim n^{2/3}$ with ε_0 a model-dependent threshold, which implies a linear relation $\sigma_{xx} \sim \mu - \varepsilon_0$ at low density. We finally study the temperature dependence and find it mostly featureless and strongest at low density.

The paper is organized as follows. Section II reminds the

basic equations that define the linear conductivity tensor in a one-band model of locally-correlated electrons (II A), discusses the drawbacks of the phenomenological scattering model characterized by a constant scattering rate (II B), and describes the microscopic scattering model used in the present work (II C). Section III reports our numerical and exact analytical results for σ_{xx} , σ_{xy} , and $R_{\rm H}$ versus density and coupling constant, for two representative electron dispersion relations in two dimensions. A discussion of the relevance of our model and results to interpret real field-effect experiments is provided in Sec. IV, followed by conclusions and perspectives in Sec. V. Additional details about the numerical method and scattering model can be found in App. A and B, respectively.

II. MODELS AND METHODS

We evaluate the longitudinal and transverse electrical conductivities for two-dimensional metals in a perpendicular magnetic field, which allows us to deduce the Hall constant, using the Kubo formula and describing the scattering with a causal (i.e., Kramers–Kronig consistent) momentumindependent self-energy. Within this framework, the Kubo conductivity tensor can be evaluated exactly up to first order in the magnetic field, using expressions that take the noninteracting electron dispersion E_k and the self-energy $\Sigma(\varepsilon)$ as the only system-dependent inputs [11, 16, 17, 43].

In this work, we consider two representative dispersions: A parabolic dispersion describing nearly free electrons or Bloch electrons sufficiently close to a conduction-band minimum, as well as a square-lattice cosine dispersion, that also becomes parabolic near the band edge. In each of these two cases, the scattering is supposed to originate from a distribution of identical pointlike impurities and it is treated by means of the impurity-averaging technique within the self-consistent Born approximation (SCBA) [44, 45].

We start this section by recalling the relevant general expressions that provide the conductivities and we briefly explain the numerical methods that we use to compute them accurately and efficiently. We then show the limitations of the phenomenological self-energy model $\Sigma(\varepsilon) = -i\Gamma$ in the low-density regime. In a last step, we define the SCBA self-energy and we display its properties, exhibiting the similarities and the differences that occur for parabolic and cosine dispersions.

A. Kubo conductivities and Hall constant for locally-correlated two-dimensional metals

The dependence of the conductivity tensor on the noninteracting electron dispersion E_k is captured by three functions of the energy *E*. The first is the noninteracting density of states (DOS), which counts the number of states per unit surface at energy *E*, using the Dirac delta function:

$$N_0(E) = 2 \int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^2} \,\delta(E - E_k) \,. \tag{1}$$

The factor 2 accounts for the electron spin. The second function is the longitudinal transport function, which also counts states, however weighted by the square of their group velocity in direction x multiplied by the electron charge e:

$$\Phi_{xx}(E) = \left(\frac{e}{\hbar}\right)^2 2 \int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^2} \left(\frac{\partial E_k}{\partial k_x}\right)^2 \delta(E - E_k).$$
(2)

The third function is the transverse transport function, where now states are weighted by a measure of the dispersion curvature:

$$\Phi_{xy}(E) = \left(\frac{|e|}{\hbar}\right)^3 \frac{2\pi^2}{3} \int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^2} \left[2\frac{\partial E_k}{\partial k_x} \frac{\partial E_k}{\partial k_y} \frac{\partial^2 E_k}{\partial k_x \partial k_y} - \left(\frac{\partial E_k}{\partial k_x}\right)^2 \frac{\partial^2 E_k}{\partial k_y^2} - \left(\frac{\partial E_k}{\partial k_y}\right)^2 \frac{\partial^2 E_k}{\partial k_x^2} \right] \delta(E - E_k).$$
(3)

These three functions are known exactly for a parabolic band, but for more general dispersions, like in the cosine case, they must be evaluated numerically. As they depend neither on the scattering mechanism, nor on the electron density or the temperature at which the conductivities are being evaluated, they only need to be calculated once when scanning these parameters. We have found convenient and numerically efficient to represent these functions as piecewise-continuous functions that are fast to evaluate at any energy E [46]. In each piece, well-chosen mathematical functions are optimized and reproduce with more than six digits fidelity the DOS and transport functions computed numerically by quadratures. Appendix A provides an illustration for $N_0(E)$.

The conductivities depend on the complex self-energy $\Sigma(\varepsilon)$ through the electron spectral function

$$A(E,\varepsilon) = \frac{-\mathrm{Im}\,\Sigma(\varepsilon)/\pi}{[\varepsilon - E - \mathrm{Re}\,\Sigma(\varepsilon)]^2 + [\mathrm{Im}\,\Sigma(\varepsilon)]^2},\qquad(4)$$

which describes the redistribution of electronic spectral weight by interactions. The spectral weight is entirely concentrated at $\varepsilon = E$ in the absence of scattering $[\Sigma(\varepsilon) = -i0]$, while otherwise it is spread around the quasiparticle energy $E^* = E + \text{Re }\Sigma(E^*)$ over an energy range typically given by $-\text{Im }\Sigma(E^*)$. The noninteracting DOS and the spectral function allow one to compute the interacting DOS,

$$N(\varepsilon) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dE N_0(E) A(E,\varepsilon), \qquad (5)$$

which differs from $N_0(\varepsilon)$ by corrections scaling with the amplitude of the self-energy. Calculations performed at fixed carrier density *n* require us to determine the chemical potential μ according to

$$n = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\varepsilon f(\varepsilon - \mu) N(\varepsilon), \qquad (6)$$

where $f(\varepsilon) = (e^{\varepsilon/k_{\rm B}T} + 1)^{-1}$ is the Fermi-Dirac distribution for temperature *T* and $k_{\rm B}$ is the Boltzmann constant.

With the chemical potential set, the longitudinal and transverse conductivities for a magnetic field *B* follow as

$$\sigma_{xx} = \pi \hbar \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\varepsilon \left[-f'(\varepsilon - \mu) \right] \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dE \, \Phi_{xx}(E) A^2(E, \varepsilon) \quad (7)$$

$$\sigma_{xy} = B \hbar \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\varepsilon \left[-f'(\varepsilon - \mu) \right] \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dE \, \Phi_{xy}(E) A^3(E, \varepsilon). \quad (8)$$

The function $f'(\varepsilon - \mu)$ is the derivative of the Fermi-Dirac distribution, which is significant in an energy range of width $\sim k_{\rm B}T$ around μ and reduces to $-\delta(\varepsilon - \mu)$ at zero temperature, thus solving the ε integral in Eqs. (7) and (8). If the transport functions are known either exactly or as fast piecewise functions, the evaluation of the conductivities at T = 0 is reduced to a single quadrature depending parametrically on μ and $\Sigma(\mu)$. In practice, we bypass this quadrature by using, in the piecewise representation of $\Phi_{xx}(E)$ and $\Phi_{xy}(E)$, a set of mathematical functions for which the *E*-integral is known exactly. In this way, we obtain σ_{xx} and σ_{xy} accurately at T = 0 without relying on any numerical quadrature. Likewise, the integral giving the DOS in Eq. (5) is performed exactly in each piece of the piecewise function $N_0(E)$ [47].

The Hall constant is finally deduced as

$$R_{\rm H} = \frac{\sigma_{xy}/B}{\sigma_{xy}^2},\tag{9}$$

which is known to approach $R_{\rm H}^0 = -1/(|e|n)$ when the scattering is sufficiently weak and the density sufficiently high [11]. We solve these equations with a particular focus on the low-density regime, for a microscopic model of self-energy describing electron scattering on weak point-like impurities. Before introducing this model, we briefly discuss the limitations of the phenomenological self-energy model $\Sigma(\varepsilon) = -i\Gamma$.

B. Drawbacks of the constant-scattering rate approximation

The Hall constant given by Eqs. (1)–(9) and its density and temperature dependencies in the case of a constant scattering rate, $\Sigma(\varepsilon) = -i\Gamma$, were studied in Ref. [11] for a class of tight-binding models. One typical result for the dispersion $E_k = -2t[\cos(k_x a) + \cos(k_y a)]$, corresponding to an isotropic square lattice with lattice parameter *a* and hopping amplitude *t*, is reproduced as the black line in Fig. 1. As the density decreases, $R_{\rm H}$ crosses over at a density n_c , where the chemical potential traverses the lower band edge, from the semiclassical behavior $R_{\rm H}^0$ to a regime where $R_{\rm H} = 4R_{\rm H}^0$. While the semiclassical behavior is universal (independent of E_k and Γ), it turns out that the anomalous behavior $R_{\rm H} = 4R_{\rm H}^0$ for $n \to 0$ is not observed for all dispersion relations.

In order to illustrate this, we show as red and blue lines in Fig. 1 the Hall constant computed in the continuum



FIG. 1. Black line: zero-temperature Hall constant for a square lattice with scattering rate $\Gamma = 0.005t$. The dashed lines indicate the asymptotic regimes $R_{\rm H} = R_{\rm H}^0$ and $R_{\rm H} = 4R_{\rm H}^0$. n_c shows Eq. (20) of Ref. [11]. Red and blue lines: zero-temperature Hall constant for a continuum model with the same mass as the square lattice, a cutoff $E_c = 80t$, and two values of the scattering rate. The dotted lines indicate the Γ -dependent plateau.

for a dispersion $E_k = \hbar^2 k^2 / (2m)$. The mass was fixed to $m = \hbar^2/(2a^2t)$, such that both parabolic and cosine dispersions coincide at the band bottom. The right-hand side of Eq. (6) is ultraviolet divergent for a constant scattering rate, which requires introducing a cutoff. We set the cutoff to $E_c = 80t$, such that the bandwidth of the continuum model is ten times that of the square lattice. Both models display a departure from the semiclassical behavior as density decreases, followed by a Γ -dependent plateau. As seen in Eq. (20) of Ref. [11], the crossover density is proportional to Γ and depends logarithmically on the bandwidth. In the parabolic case, R_H stays at the plateau until the chemical potential reaches unphysically large negative values exceeding $-E_c$, where a crossover to $1/n^2$ behavior occurs (dimmed red color). The value $12\pi^2 t/(5\Gamma)$ of $R_{\rm H}$ on the plateau can be obtained by studying Eqs. (1)–(9) at T = 0 in the regime $-E_c \ll \mu \ll 0$ (see Sec. III A).

Despite the fact that the model $\Sigma(\varepsilon) = -i\Gamma$ gives a decent description at intermediate densities, one weakness is that the scattering rate fails to drop to zero at high and low energy, which has several peculiar consequences: (i) the spectral function is a Lorentzian with unbounded $1/\varepsilon^2$ tails; (ii) the interacting DOS extends to $\varepsilon = -\infty$ with $1/\varepsilon$ tail, reduced to $1/\varepsilon^2$ after introduction of the cutoff; (iii) the zero-temperature chemical potential diverges as $\mu \propto -1/n$ as $n \to 0$; (iv) the conductivities depend on the ultraviolet structure of the theory, while in principle they should be set by low-energy properties at T = 0. In the continuum model, the conductivities behave as $\sigma_{xx} \propto n^2/E_c^2$ and $\sigma_{xy}/B \propto n^4/(\Gamma E_c^4)$ on the plateau. This dependence on the cutoff cancels out in the Hall constant, but it nevertheless highlights a pathology of the phenomenological constant-scattering rate approximation. Self-energy functions originating from microscopic models should ensure that the scattering rate drops to zero at sufficiently high and low energies, which solves the problems (i)-(iv) mentioned

above, but complicates the evaluation of the conductivities.

C. Impurity scattering in the self-consistent Born approximation

1. Definition and general properties of the self-energy

A concentration n_i of identical impurities characterized by a potential v(r) and located at random positions generates, after performing an average over the random positions, an effective self-energy for the electrons [44, 45]. The leading term (Born approximation) of this self-energy represents processes, where an electron scatters twice off the same impurity. It is given by

$$\Sigma^{\text{BA}}(\boldsymbol{k},\varepsilon) = n_i \int \frac{d^2 q}{(2\pi)^2} v(-\boldsymbol{q}) G_0(\boldsymbol{k}+\boldsymbol{q},\varepsilon) v(\boldsymbol{q}), \quad (10)$$

with v(q) the Fourier transform of the impurity potential and $G_0(\mathbf{k},\varepsilon) = 1/(\varepsilon - E_k + i0)$ the noninteracting Green's function describing the free propagation of the electron between these two scattering events. The selfenergy changes the electron propagator from $G_0(\mathbf{k},\varepsilon)$ to $G(\mathbf{k},\varepsilon) = 1/[\varepsilon - E_k - \Sigma^{BA}(\mathbf{k},\varepsilon)]$. The model can therefore be made self-consistent if one replaces G_0 by G in Eq. (10).

In the following, we will use this self-consistent model in the case of point-like impurities, for which $v(q) \equiv v_0$ is a constant. One sees that the self-energy looses any momentum dependence in this limit, and that the integral in Eq. (10) only samples the dispersion E_k , which allows one to recast it as an energy integral involving the noninteracting DOS. We write this self-consistent model in the form

$$\Sigma^{\text{SCBA}}(\varepsilon) = (ga)^2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dE \, \frac{N_0(E)}{\varepsilon - E - \Sigma^{\text{SCBA}}(\varepsilon)}, \qquad (11)$$

where $(ga)^2 = n_i v_0^2/2$. The factor 1/2 corrects for the spin sum, that is not present in Eq. (10) but included in $N_0(E)$. The parameter *g* with units of energy will be our coupling constant, while *a* is a model-dependent characteristic length that can be set as the unit of length when expressing $N_0(E)$. As it is derived from the Born approximation, the SCBA is valid in the limit of vanishing v_0 , where the effect of impurity scattering only depends on the product $n_i v_0^2$. When we set the coupling *g* to a finite value, it is understood that n_i is large and v_0 is small, i.e., we are in a regime of dense and weak disorder. In the opposite regime of dilute and strong impurities, the self-energy depends separately on n_i and v_0 .

The numerical evaluation of $\Sigma^{\text{SCBA}}(\varepsilon)$ requires nesting a quadrature inside a root-finding algorithm. Here again, we bypass the quadrature by using, in the piecewise representation of $N_0(E)$, mathematical functions that allow us to perform the *E*-integral in Eq. (11) exactly in each piece. An illustration of the method for the cosine dispersion is given in Appendix A. We then construct and store accurate piecewise representations of $\Sigma^{\text{SCBA}}(\varepsilon)$ for each dispersion relation and each value of *g*. In this way, the inversion of Eq. (6) for μ , which is the most time-consuming part of the calculation, requires a single quadrature nested in a root-finding algorithm, while a straightforward implementation would have demanded two nested root findings involving up to seven nested quadratures.

For our purposes, the most important property that distinguishes qualitatively $\Sigma^{\text{SCBA}}(\varepsilon)$ from the phenomenological model $\Sigma(\varepsilon) = -i\Gamma$ is that the scattering rate $-\text{Im} \Sigma^{\text{SCBA}}(\varepsilon)$ vanishes beyond an energy ε_0 outside the noninteracting band [48]. This may be seen by observing the behavior of Eq. (11) for $\varepsilon \to \infty$: If we assume that $\text{Im} \Sigma^{\text{SCBA}}(\varepsilon)$ in the right-hand side of the equation decays as $1/\varepsilon^{\nu}$ with $\nu \ge 0$ required by causality, we then see that $\text{Im} \Sigma^{\text{SCBA}}(\varepsilon)$ on the left-hand side would decay as $1/\varepsilon^{\nu+2}$. This excludes any solution with polynomial decay of $\text{Im} \Sigma^{\text{SCBA}}(\varepsilon)$ at infinity. A similar reasoning shows that $\text{Re} \Sigma^{\text{SCBA}}(\varepsilon) \sim 1/\varepsilon$

For both the parabolic and cosine dispersions, the noninteracting DOS is discontinuous at the band bottom. In contrast, Im $\Sigma^{\text{SCBA}}(\varepsilon)$ approaches zero continuously like a square root at ε_0 , as demonstrated in Appendix B. On the other hand, Re $\Sigma^{\text{SCBA}}(\varepsilon)$ approaches a finite value at ε_0 and increases linearly for $\varepsilon > \varepsilon_0$. Therefore, using the notation $\Sigma^{\text{SCBA}}(\varepsilon) = \Sigma_1(\varepsilon) + i\Sigma_2(\varepsilon)$, the asymptotic behavior of $\Sigma^{\text{SCBA}}(\varepsilon)$ near the band bottom for $\varepsilon \gtrsim \varepsilon_0$ is

$$\Sigma^{\text{SCBA}}(\varepsilon) = \Sigma_1(\varepsilon_0) + \Sigma_1'(\varepsilon_0)(\varepsilon - \varepsilon_0) - iC\sqrt{\varepsilon - \varepsilon_0}.$$
 (12)

An expression for the constant *C* is provided in Appendix **B**.

The SCBA offers a peculiar property that proves useful in obtaining exact asymptotic results for the zero-temperature conductivities: The interacting DOS is proportional to the scattering rate. This may be seen from Eqs. (11), (4), and (5), using the fact that Im $\{1/[\varepsilon - E - \Sigma(\varepsilon)]\} = -\pi A(E, \varepsilon)$:

$$N(\varepsilon) = \frac{-\mathrm{Im}\,\Sigma^{\mathrm{SCBA}}(\varepsilon)}{\pi(ga)^2}.$$
(13)

If the asymptotic form $N(\varepsilon \gtrsim \varepsilon_0) = \frac{C}{\pi(ga)^2} \sqrt{\varepsilon - \varepsilon_0}$ is injected in Eq. (6) and the temperature is set to zero, the density is found to vary as $n = \frac{2C}{3\pi(ga)^2} (\mu - \varepsilon_0)^{3/2}$, which provides the asymptotic low-density behavior of the chemical potential at T = 0:

$$\mu = \varepsilon_0 + \left(\frac{3\pi (ga)^2}{2C}n\right)^{2/3} \qquad (T = 0, n \to 0).$$
(14)

This is qualitatively different from the case of a constant scattering rate, where the chemical potential diverges as $-\Gamma/n$ at low carrier density [11]. Equation (14) shows that the energy ε_0 and the amplitude *C* are the key properties of the self-energy that control the asymptotic low-density physics. In the next subsections, we display the dependence of these two parameters on the coupling constant *g* for the parabolic and cosine dispersions.

2. SCBA self-energy for a parabolic dispersion

When using the parabolic model $E_k = \hbar^2 k^2/(2m)$, we set the Bohr radius corresponding to the mass *m* as the



FIG. 2. Real part (blue) and imaginary part (red) of the selfenergy given by Eq. (16) for g = 0.5 Hr and $E_c = 10$ Hr. The dashed line shows the imaginary part of Eq. (12) with *C* given by Eq. (17b). The shaded region indicates the noninteracting band. Insets: illustration of the dependencies of ε_0 and *C* on *g*, as given by Eq. (17).

unit of length, i.e., $a = 4\pi\epsilon_0\hbar^2/(me^2)$. For the unit of energy, we use the corresponding Hartree Hr = $\hbar^2/(ma^2)$, which is twice the kinetic energy for a wavevector 1/a. The DOS as defined by Eq. (1) is flat for positive energies, $N_0(E) = N_0\theta(E)$, where $N_0 = m/(\pi\hbar^2) = 1/(\pi a^2$ Hr) and $\theta(E)$ is the Heaviside step function. Eq. (11) is logarithmically divergent for this unbounded $N_0(E)$. We therefore introduce an ultraviolet cutoff E_c for the noninteracting DOS of the parabolic band,

$$N_0(E) = N_0 \theta(E) \theta(E_c - E).$$
(15)

It follows that the SCBA self-energy is given by the implicit equation

$$\Sigma^{\text{SCBA}}(\varepsilon) = (ga)^2 N_0 \left\{ \ln \left[\varepsilon - \Sigma^{\text{SCBA}}(\varepsilon) \right] - \ln \left[\varepsilon - \Sigma^{\text{SCBA}}(\varepsilon) - E_c \right] \right\}. \quad (16)$$

Despite the cutoff dependence of the self-energy, we will see that the conductivities and the Hall coefficient have a well-defined limit when the cutoff is sent to infinity.

The numerical solution of Eq. (16) for g = 0.5 Hr and $E_c = 10$ Hr is depicted in Fig. 2. A large coupling g is chosen here for illustration purposes, while small values will be considered later to generate realistic conductivities. As expected, the imaginary part vanishes as a square root at a coupling-dependent energy ε_0 below the edge of the non-interacting band. The real part is continuous at ε_0 with a vertical slope below ε_0 and a finite slope above ε_0 (Appendix B). The relative simplicity of Eq. (16) allows us to obtain closed expressions for ε_0 and *C* in this case (Appendix B), that we express here using the dimensionless



FIG. 3. Real part (blue) and imaginary part (red) of the selfenergy given by Eq. (11) for a cosine dispersion and a coupling g = t. The dashed line shows the imaginary part of Eq. (12) with *C* given by Eq. (B4). The shaded region indicates the noninteracting band. Insets: illustration of the dependencies of ε_0 and *C* on *g*. $\Delta \varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0 + 4t$ is the energy shift from the band edge.

parameter $\gamma = 4(ga)^2 N_0 / E_c$:

$$\varepsilon_0 = -\frac{E_c}{4} \left[2\left(\sqrt{1+\gamma} - 1\right) + \gamma \ln \frac{\sqrt{1+\gamma} + 1}{\sqrt{1+\gamma} - 1} \right]$$
(17a)

$$C = \frac{\sqrt{E_c \gamma/2}}{(1+\gamma)^{1/4}}.$$
 (17b)

These formula are displayed in the insets of Fig. 2. ε_0 varies initially as g^2 with a logarithmic correction, while *C* grows initially as *g*. Note that *C* approaches $(2/\pi)^{1/2}g/\sqrt{\text{Hr}}$ for a large cutoff, while ε_0 depends logarithmically on the cutoff as $-g^2/(\pi \text{Hr})\{1 - \ln[g^2/(\pi \text{Hr}E_c)]\}$.

3. SCBA self-energy for a cosine dispersion

In the tight-binding approximation, a two-dimensional square lattice with nearest-neighbor hopping energy -t has a dispersion relation $E_k = -2t[\cos(k_x a) + \cos(k_y a)]$, where a is the lattice parameter. We take t > 0 and insert a minus sign, such that the bottom of the band is at $\mathbf{k} = 0$ with a positive curvature and a mass given by $m = \hbar^2/(2a^2t)$. When using this model, we choose a as the unit of length and t as the unit of energy. The exact noninteracting DOS is known in terms of an elliptic function. As this elliptic function prevents the exact evaluation of the E-integrals in Eqs. (5) and (11), we use a piecewise representation of $N_0(E)$ to avoid numerical quadratures (see Appendix A).

The numerical solution of Eq. (11) for g = t is depicted in Fig. 3. Again, we use a large coupling for illustration purposes. We show the full energy dependence to illustrate the particle-hole symmetry resulting from this dispersion, with odd, respectively even real and imaginary parts. The square-root behavior of the imaginary part, vertical slope of the real part for $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, and finite slope for $\varepsilon > \varepsilon_0$ are similar to the results found in the parabolic case. The noninteracting DOS has edge discontinuities at $\varepsilon = \pm 4t$ and a Van Hove singularity at $\varepsilon = 0$ (Appendix A). These non-analyticities are renormalized by impurity scattering, leading to shifted and rounded features in $N(\varepsilon) \propto -\text{Im} \Sigma^{\text{SCBA}}(\varepsilon)$. The figure also shows the dependencies of ε_0 and *C* on the coupling *g*, where it is seen that the behaviors are similar to those observed with the parabolic band.

III. NUMERICAL AND EXACT ASYMPTOTIC RESULTS AT ZERO TEMPERATURE

A glance at Eqs. (7), (8), and (4) reveals that, at T = 0, the conductivities only depend on the chemical potential and self-energy through the complex number $\mu - \Sigma(\mu)$. For a parabolic band, the transport functions $\Phi_{xx}(E)$ and $\Phi_{xy}(E)$ are known exactly and explicit functions of $\mu - \Sigma(\mu)$ can be deduced for σ_{xx} , σ_{xy} , and $R_{\rm H}$. We start by providing these functions, as they are valid for any local self-energy and may be used, in particular, to calculate the values of $R_{\rm H}$ on the plateau, as displayed in Fig. 1. We then present numerical and exact asymptotic results obtained with the SCBA selfenergy, both for the quadratic and cosine dispersions. Like in the constant-scattering rate approximation, we find a lowdensity quantum regime, where the conductivities and Hall constant deviate from the semiclassical behavior. Unlike in this approximation, however, the deviations present identical universal features for both dispersion relations.

A. Zero-temperature conductivity tensor for a parabolic dispersion and a generic local self-energy

At zero temperature, Eqs. (7) and (8) reduce to

$$\sigma_{xx} = \pi \hbar \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dE \, \Phi_{xx}(E) \left[\operatorname{Im} \frac{-1/\pi}{\mu - \Sigma(\mu) - E} \right]^2 \qquad (18)$$

$$\sigma_{xy} = B\hbar \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dE \,\Phi_{xy}(E) \left[\operatorname{Im} \frac{-1/\pi}{\mu - \Sigma(\mu) - E} \right]^3.$$
(19)

For a parabolic dispersion, both transport functions are linear functions of the energy:

$$\Phi_{xx}(E) = \left(\frac{e}{\hbar}\right)^2 \frac{E}{\pi} \theta(E)$$
(20)

$$\Phi_{xy}(E) = -\left(\frac{|e|}{\hbar}\right)^3 \frac{2\pi\hbar^2 E}{3m}\theta(E).$$
(21)

The *E*-integrals in Eqs. (18) and (19) are therefore convergent without ultraviolet cutoff. It is convenient to introduce the modulus and the phase of the complex number $\mu - \Sigma(\mu) \equiv M e^{i\phi}$. Since Im $\Sigma(\mu)$ is strictly negative, the phase is constrained to the interval $0 < \phi < \pi$. Evaluating the integrals, we find the conductivities in terms of those

variables,

$$\sigma_{xx} = \frac{e^2}{h} \frac{1 + (\pi - \phi)\cot\phi}{\pi}$$
(22)

$$\sigma_{xy} = -\frac{e^2}{h} \frac{Ba^2}{\Phi_0} \frac{\text{Hr}}{M} \frac{1 + (\pi - \phi)\cot\phi - \frac{1}{3}\sin^2\phi}{\sin\phi}, \quad (23)$$

where $\Phi_0 = h/|e|$ is the magnetic flux quantum and we remind that $Hr = \hbar^2/(ma^2)$.

Interestingly, σ_{xx} only depends on the phase ϕ . Eq. (22) recovers the Drude formula in the semiclassical limit, where the chemical potential is given by the electron gas formula, $\mu = \pi \hbar^2 n/m$, and the self-energy is related to the carrier lifetime τ as $\Sigma(\mu) = -i\hbar/(2\tau)$. For large τ , the phase approaches zero as $\phi \to \hbar/(2\tau\mu)$ and Eq. (22) gives $\sigma_{xx} = e^2/(h\phi) = ne^2\tau/m$. Likewise, σ_{xy} approaches the Drude result $-ne^2\omega_c\tau^2/m$ in this limit, where $\omega_c = |e|B/m$ is the cyclotron frequency.

Inserting Eqs. (22) and (23) in Eq. (9), we obtain the Hall constant

$$R_{\rm H} = -\frac{1}{|e|N_0} \frac{F(\phi)}{M} \tag{24a}$$

$$F(\phi) = \pi \frac{(\pi - \phi)\cos\phi + \frac{3}{4}\sin\phi + \frac{1}{12}\sin(3\phi)}{[(\pi - \phi)\cos\phi + \sin\phi]^2}.$$
 (24b)

Since F(0) = 1, this expression recovers the semiclassical result $R_{\rm H}^0$ if $\mu - \Sigma(\mu) = n/N_0 + i0$. Another important limit is $\phi \to \pi$, which occurs in the quantum regime at vanishingly low density, when the renormalized chemical potential $\mu - \text{Re} \Sigma(\mu)$ is below the noninteracting band and its magnitude is much larger than the scattering rate $-\text{Im} \Sigma(\mu)$. In this limit, $F(\phi)$ diverges as $\frac{6\pi}{5} \frac{1}{\pi - \phi}$. For instance, if $\Sigma(\varepsilon) = -i\Gamma$ and $n \to 0$, μ approaches $-\infty$, ϕ approches $\pi + \Gamma/\mu$, and M approaches $-\mu$, such that $R_{\rm H}$ approaches $-6\pi^2/(5\Gamma)$ in units of $a^2\text{Hr}/|e|$. This becomes $12\pi^2t/(5\Gamma)$ with the units chosen in Fig. 1.

B. Anomalous power laws at low-density in the self-consistent Born approximation

1. Parabolic dispersion

In Figs. 4(a) and 4(b), we plot the normal and Hall conductivities computed with Eqs. (1)–(9) at T = 0 for a range of densities, using a parabolic dispersion and the SCBA selfenergy (Sec. II C 2) with g = 0.01 Hr. Since the self-energy in Eq. (16) is not convergent without a cutoff imposed to $N_0(E)$, we apply the same cutoff procedure to $\Phi_{xx}(E)$ and $\Phi_{xy}(E)$ for consistency in the numerical calculations, although this has no visible effect on the conductivities displayed in the figure. To express the densities in cm⁻² as indicated on the upper axis of the graphs, we set the band mass to the bare electron mass, such that *a* coincides with the usual Bohr radius, Hr with the usual Hartree, and $g \approx 0.27$ eV.

With reducing the density n, both conductivities quit the semiclassical behavior proportional to n. This occurs at



FIG. 4. (a) Normal conductivity, (b) Hall conductivity, and (c) Hall constant versus density at T = 0 for a parabolic band and the SCBA self-energy with g = 0.01 Hr. (d) Comparison of the Hall constants for two values of g. All quantities are computed with a cutoff $E_c = 10$ Hr and σ_{xy} is displayed for a field B = 1 T and a mass m equal to the electron mass. The dashed lines show the exact asymptotic results given in the text. The solid and dashed arrows show the density n_0 at which $\mu = 0$ in Eq. (14) and n_c from Eq. (29), respectively. Inset: mobilities $\mu_n = \sigma_{xx}/(n|e|)$ and $\mu_{\rm H} = -\sigma_{xx}R_{\rm H}$ for the same density range as in panel (a).

a density close to the value where the chemical potential crosses the bottom of the noninteracting band, as estimated by n_0 , the solution of Eq. (14) with $\mu = 0$. For the particular value of g, the change of behavior takes place at physically accessible densities of order 10^{12} cm⁻², when the conductivity is similar to the quantum e^2/h and the mobility is of order 200 cm^2/Vs . We compare in the inset of Fig. 4 two different definitions of the mobility, $\mu_n = \sigma_{xx}/(n|e|)$ and $\mu_{\rm H} = -\sigma_{xx}R_{\rm H}$, which coincide in the semiclassical regime. In the low-density quantum regime, σ_{xx} displays a power law with exponent 2/3. Accordingly, the mobilities μ_n and $\mu_{\rm H}$ cease to be good measures of the scattering. On the other hand, σ_{xy} crosses over from the high-density linear regime to a low-density regime where it is still linear in *n*, but with a different factor. Consequently, the Hall constant crosses over from the semiclassical $\sim 1/n$ to an anomalous behavior $\sim 1/n^{1/3}$, as illustrated in Figs. 4(c) and 4(d). The crossover density n_c [defined in Eq. (29)], below which $R_{\rm H}$ is no longer a good measure of the number of carriers, increases like g^2 as the scattering gets stronger.

The low-density power laws plotted as dashed lines in Fig. 4 may be derived from Eq. (22)-(24). Using Eqs. (B5), (B6), and (14), we find that the asymptotic expression for

 $\mu - \Sigma^{\text{SCBA}}(\mu)$ when *n* approches zero is

$$Me^{i\phi} = -\frac{E_c}{2} \left(\sqrt{1+\gamma} - 1\right) + iC \left(\frac{3\pi(ga)^2}{2C}n\right)^{1/3}, \quad (25)$$

where the cutoff dependence arises from the self-energy. This expression shows that $M \cos \phi$ is negative as $n \to 0$, such that ϕ approaches π in this limit. Inserting Eq. (25) in Eq. (22) and letting the cutoff E_c go to infinity in the resulting expression, we find

$$\sigma_{xx} = \frac{e^2}{h} \frac{\pi}{3^{1/3}} \left(\frac{g}{\text{Hr}}\right)^{-\frac{4}{3}} (na^2)^{\frac{2}{3}} \qquad (n \to 0).$$
(26)

This formula shows that if the quantities g^2 and n have similar values in atomic Hartree units, then the conductivity is of the order of e^2/h . For the Hall conductivity, we find the linear-in-n behavior

$$\sigma_{xy} = -\frac{e^2}{h} \frac{Ba^2}{\Phi_0} \frac{2\pi^4}{5} \left(\frac{g}{\text{Hr}}\right)^{-4} na^2 \qquad (n \to 0).$$
(27)

Since $\sigma_{xy} \sim g^{-4}$ and $\sigma_{xx} \sim g^{-4/3}$, the information on the coupling constant *g* does not disappear from *R*_H. Indeed, for the Hall constant we find

$$R_{\rm H} = -\frac{a^2}{|e|} \frac{3^{2/3} 2\pi^2}{5} \left(\frac{g}{\rm Hr}\right)^{-\frac{4}{3}} (na^2)^{-\frac{1}{3}} \qquad (n \to 0).$$
(28)

While n_0 marks the onset of the deviations from the semiclassical regime, a characteristic density n_c marking the onset of the quantum regime may be defined as the crossing point between Eq. (28) and the semiclassical expression $R_{\rm H}^0$. We thus get

$$n_c = \frac{1}{a^2} \frac{5^{3/2}}{6\sqrt{2}\pi^3} \left(\frac{g}{Hr}\right)^2,$$
 (29)

which is displayed as dashed arrows in Fig. 4.

2. Cosine dispersion

As the conductivities are controlled by $\mu - \Sigma(\mu)$ [Eqs. (18) and (19)] and both $\Sigma(\varepsilon)$ and $N(\varepsilon)$ display universality at low density in the SCBA [Eqs. (12) and (13)], we expect universality in the conductivities, at least for all dispersion relations that yield linear-in-energy transport functions at low energy. This is the case if the bottom of the band is parabolic, like in the cosine dispersion. The conductivities and Hall constant obtained at T = 0 using a cosine dispersion and the corresponding SCBA self-energy (Sec. II C 3) with g = 0.01t are plotted in Fig. 5. A comparison with g = 0.1tis shown in Fig. 5(d). The lattice parameter is set to a =3 Å in order to express the densities in $\rm cm^{-2}$ and evaluate the mobilities, and we plot the Hall conductivity for a field B = 0.031 T, in order to have the same magnetic flux as with the parabolic band. We find striking similarities with the parabolic case and, in particular, the same anomalous power-law exponents for σ_{xx} and $R_{\rm H}$ in the quantum regime.



FIG. 5. Same as Fig. 4 for a cosine dispersion. σ_{xy} is displayed for B = 0.031 T and a = 3 Å. The dashed arrows show n_c from Eq. (33). The green shade shows the effect of changing μ to $\mu \times (1 \pm 10^{-7})$ in the numerical calculations.

One can see that the numerical data present some noise below $na^2 \sim 10^{-7}$. It turns out that the calculations are challenging in this regime, as very small variations in the value of μ have significant consequences for σ_{xx} , σ_{xy} , and $R_{\rm H}$. The green-shaded regions in Fig. 5 represent the variations in the value of σ_{xx} , σ_{xy} , and $R_{\rm H}$ if a *relative* change of only $\pm 10^{-7}$ is applied to μ . This illustrates the interest of having exact results for benchmarking the numerical calculations.

In order to obtain asymptotic expressions for the conductivities, we linearize the transport functions in Eqs. (18) and (19), which leads to expressions analogous to Eqs. (22) and (23). The linearized transport functions are [11] $\Phi_{xx}(E) = (e/\hbar)^2 (1/\pi)(E + 4t)\theta(E + 4t)$ and $\Phi_{xy}(E) =$ $-(|e|/\hbar)^3 a^2 t (4\pi/3)(E+4t)\theta(E+4t)$. We then use Eqs. (12) and (14) to determine $\mu - \Sigma^{\text{SCBA}}(\mu)$, and we expand for μ close to ε_0 . The result is

$$\sigma_{xx} = \frac{e^2}{h} \frac{1}{(12\pi)^{1/3}} \frac{(Cg)^{4/3}}{\left[\varepsilon_0 - \Sigma_1(\varepsilon_0) + 4t\right]^2} \left(na^2\right)^{\frac{2}{3}}$$
(30)

$$\sigma_{xy} = -\frac{e^2}{h} \frac{Ba^2}{\Phi_0} \frac{2\pi}{5} \frac{t(Cg)^2}{\left[\varepsilon_0 - \Sigma_1(\varepsilon_0) + 4t\right]^4} na^2.$$
(31)

These expressions depend on ε_0 and *C*, for which we lack closed forms in the cosine case. The dependence on ε_0 drops from $R_{\rm H}$, which only depends on *C*:

$$R_{\rm H} = -\frac{a^2}{|e|} \frac{4(18\pi^5)^{1/3}}{5} \frac{t}{(Cg)^{2/3}} (na^2)^{-\frac{1}{3}}.$$
 (32)

We can again define the crossover density n_c displayed in

Fig. 5 by comparing Eq. (32) with $R_{\rm H}^0$:

$$n_c = \frac{1}{a^2} \frac{5^{3/2}}{24\sqrt{2}\pi^{5/2}} \frac{Cg}{t^{3/2}}.$$
 (33)

Since $C \propto g$ (Fig. 3), n_c varies as g^2 , like in the parabolic case.

IV. DISCUSSION

The results presented in the preceding section show that marked deviations from the semiclassical transport behavior do occur in a model of disordered metal at low carrier density. In this discussion, we first describe the possible manifestations of these deviations in field-effect experiments performed on two-dimensional materials and we propose strategies to reveal and analyze them. We then comment on probable limitations in the range of validity of the model, due to localization of the carriers by the disorder.

A. Signatures of the quantum regime in field-effect experiments

Two-dimensional metals with low carrier densities have been realized experimentally by field-effect doping of 2D semiconductors [49–52]. The external electric field pushes the chemical potential inside the conduction or valence band of the semiconductor, providing electron or hole carriers. In those experiments, the number of doped carriers is commonly estimated using the Hall number

$$n_{\rm H} = -\frac{1}{|e|R_{\rm H}}.$$
 (34)

Given that $R_{\rm H}$ departs from the semiclassical behavior towards lower values at low density (Figs. 4 and 5), we expect that the Hall number overestimates the carrier density in this regime. The control variable of field-effect experiments is the gate voltage, which should be related linearly with the chemical potential in the absence of nonlinearities of the dielectric response. In Fig. 6, we therefore plot the conductivities and the Hall constant for the parabolic dispersion, using the chemical potential rather than the density as the abscissa. We set *m* to the electron mass to express the chemical potential in eV and we use a coupling constant g = 1 eV. With these parameters, the normal conductivity reaches $\sim e^2/h$ when the chemical potential is 50 meV above the interacting band edge ε_0 , and the mobility is ~ 20 cm²/Vs [Fig. 6(a)]. These values are similar to those typically observed in experiments [49-51].

Interestingly, σ_{xx} is seemingly linear as a function of μ , in contrast to what is observed versus *n* in Fig. 4(a). A linear variation of σ_{xx} is commonly observed in field-effect experiments, where it is used to determine the band edge by extrapolation [53]. In the quantum regime, the linearity arises because $\sigma_{xx} \propto n^{2/3}$, while $n \propto (\mu - \varepsilon_0)^{3/2}$. The Hall conductivity σ_{xy} , which is proportional to *n* [Fig. 4(b)],



FIG. 6. (a) Normal conductivity, (b) Hall conductivity, and (c) Hall and true carrier densities versus chemical potential at T = 0 for a parabolic band and the SCBA self-energy with g = 1 eV $\mu > 0$ in the shaded regions. (d) Comparison of the Hall and true carrier densities for two values of g. All quantities are computed with a cutoff $E_c = 10$ Hr and a mass m equal to the electron mass. σ_{xy} is displayed for a field B = 1 T. The dashed lines show the asymptotic results given in the text. Inset: mobilities $\mu_n = \sigma_{xx}/(n|e|)$ and $\mu_{\rm H} = -\sigma_{xx}R_{\rm H}$ for the same range of chemical potential as in panel (a).

changes from $(\mu - \varepsilon_0)^{3/2}$ in the quantum regime to $(\mu - \varepsilon_0)^1$ in the semiclassical regime which, if experimentally observed, would provide evidence for the quantum regime. The Hall mobility provides yet another signature of the crossover to the quantum regime, in the form of a local maximum. We note that a maximum in the gate-voltage dependence of the Hall mobility of WSe₂ field-effect transistors has been reported in Ref. [51]. In Figs. **6**(c) and **6**(d), we compare $n_{\rm H}$ with the actual carrier density *n*. When the chemical potential is between ε_0 (bottom of the "impurity band") and 0 (bottom of the noninteracting band), the Hall carrier density may indeed overestimate the true carrier density by several orders of magnitude. In Ref. [49], clear deviations of $1/R_{\rm H}$ from the semiclassical linear behavior were reported for two organic field-effect transistors.

A complementary approach to reveal the transition into the quantum regime is to study scaling relations displayed by conductivities. In the semiclassical regime, two remarkable universalities have proven very important in analyzing experimental transport data: $R_{\rm H}$ is independent of the scattering and the mobility $\mu_{\rm H} = -\sigma_{xx}R_{\rm H}$ is independent of the carrier density. These two properties hold true, irrespective of the microscopic origin of the scattering. In the quantum regime, it is generally possible that suitable combinations of σ_{xx} and $R_{\rm H}$ can be constructed, one depending only on the density and the other depending only on the coupling constant. It is unlikely that these combinations are identical for all scattering mechanisms, though. Therefore, the observation of a particular scaling relation in the quantum regime could help identifying the dominant scattering mechanism.

In the case of impurity scattering treated in the SCBA, the first scaling relation is found by eliminating g from Eqs. (26) and (28), which gives the correct measure of the carrier density in the quantum regime:

$$\frac{6\pi}{5} \frac{\sigma_{xx}/(e^2/h)}{-|e|R_{\rm H}} = n.$$
(35)

Conversely, by eliminating n, one finds a proper measure of the coupling constant,

$$\frac{1}{-|e|R_{\rm H}\sqrt{\sigma_{xx}/(e^2/h)}} = \frac{1}{a^2} \frac{5}{2\sqrt{3}\pi^{5/2}} \left(\frac{g}{\rm Hr}\right)^2, \qquad (36)$$

which is proportional to n_c defined in Eq. (29). For 2D materials in which the coupling constant could be tuned, for example by varying the concentration of impurities, these scaling laws should only hold in the quantum regime, which would provide another way to reveal the quantum to semiclassical crossover, beside the change of behavior in σ_{xy} seen in Fig. 6(b). Concerning field-effect experiments, where the control parameter is μ , another scaling relation may be constructed by combining Eqs. (26), (28), and (14),

$$\frac{\sqrt{\sigma_{xx}/(e^2/h)}}{-|e|R_{\rm H}} = \frac{1}{a^2} \frac{5}{3\sqrt{3}\pi^{5/2}} \frac{\mu - \varepsilon_0}{\rm Hr},$$
(37)

which only depends on *g* via the conduction threshold ε_0 .

We point out that these scaling relations and the power laws obtained in the quantum regime are robust to changes in the system's dimensionality and may be observed as well in quasi-2D and 3D disordered metals. Indeed, the equations (4)-(8) that define the conductivities are valid in 3D for describing the transport in the plane perpendicular to the magnetic field. The power laws that we find at low density occur in 3D as well, namely $\sigma_{xx} \sim n^{2/3}$, $\sigma_{xy} \sim n$ versus density and $\sigma_{xx} \sim \mu - \epsilon_0$, $\sigma_{xy} \sim (\mu - \epsilon_0)^{3/2}$ versus chemical potential. To explain this, we note that the power laws can be traced back to three facts: (i) the conductivities given in Eqs. (22) and (23) vary as $(\pi - \phi)^2$ and $(\pi - \phi)^3$ for $\phi \to \pi$; (ii) $\pi - \phi$ is proportional to Im $\sum_{\alpha}^{SCBA}(\mu) \propto (\mu - \varepsilon_0)^{1/2}$; and (iii) the density varies as $(\mu - \varepsilon_0)^{3/2}$. The argument leading to Im $\Sigma^{\text{SCBA}}(\varepsilon) = -C(\mu - \varepsilon_0)^{1/2}$ does not use the specific form of $N_0(\varepsilon)$, as can be seen in Appendix B. Therefore, this same square-root behavior occurs in 3D, fulfilling the condition (ii), although the dependencies of the parameters ε_0 and *C* on the coupling *g* are different in 2D and 3D. The property (iii) follows from Eq. (13), which again does not depend on the specific form of $N_0(\varepsilon)$ and holds in 3D. Finally, the transport functions $\Phi_{xx}(E)$ and $\Phi_{xy}(E)$ vary as $E^{3/2}$ in 3D, such that Eqs. (22) and (23) get replaced by different functions of ϕ . These new functions nevertheless obey the conditions (i), as the exponent of the transport functions determines the coefficient, but not the leading exponent of the expansion in powers of $\pi - \phi$.



FIG. 7. (a) Temperature dependence of the Hall constant for a parabolic band and the SCBA self-energy with g = 1 eV and a cutoff $E_c = 10$ Hr. (b) Hall constant and chemical potential versus *T* for three electron densities.

Finally, one may wonder whether the temperature dependence could also provides some hint on the quantum regime. Indeed, an anomaly occurs in the temperature dependence of the Hall constant in the constant-scattering rate approximation, when the chemical potential traverses the edge of the noninteracting band [11]. The anomaly is largest at the lowest densities. In the case of the SCBA, however, we only find a very weak anomaly. Figure 7(a) shows that $R_{\rm H}$ returns to the semiclassical power law as the temperature is raised. The details of the temperature dependence are displayed in Fig. 7(b) for three representative carrier densities. For $n = 10^{-2}a^{-2}$, $R_{\rm H}$ has virtually no temperature dependence, as expected in the semiclassical regime. The chemical potential remains far from both the noninteracting and impurity band edges. For $n = 2.8 \times 10^{-5} a^{-2}$, the chemical potential is just above the edge of the impurity band at T = 0 and crosses it as T increases. $R_{\rm H}$ raises nonetheless monotonously towards $R_{\rm H}^0$. At the density $1.09 \times 10^{-3} a^{-2}$, μ is just above the noninteracting band edge at T = 0 and crosses it as T increases. Here, we see a non-monotonous evolution of $R_{\rm H}$ with increasing *T*, but the amplitude of the effect is tiny.

Thus, the large amplitude of the anomalous temperature dependence found in Ref. [11] appears to be peculiar to the constant-scattering rate approximation. In the SCBA, despite the absence of a strong anomaly, the temperature dependence evolves from being very weak in the semiclassical regime to being significant deep in the quantum regime, where $R_{\rm H}$ increases by a factor two between base and room temperatures with the parameters of Fig. 7.

B. Anderson localization and validity of the SCBA

In the absence of inelastic scattering, a two-dimensional electron gas subject to elastic disorder is expected to become insulating if the localization length $\xi \sim \ell e^{\frac{\pi}{2}k_{\rm F}\ell}$ is shorter than the typical sample size L [54, 55]. Here $k_{\rm F}$ is the Fermi wavevector and ℓ is the elastic mean free path. The localization is unlikely at high density $k_{\rm F}\ell \gg 1$, given the exponential increase of ξ , but it is expected if $k_{\rm F}\ell \lesssim 1$. In



FIG. 8. Estimated density n_L of the metal-insulator transition due to Anderson localization, versus electron phase-coherence length L_{ϕ} for two values of the coupling *g*. n_0 (solid horizontal lines) and n_c (dashed horizontal lines) correspond with the arrows in Fig. 4(d).

real materials, inelastic scattering is always present and it reduces the electron phase-coherence length L_{ϕ} to values smaller than the sample size. This renormalizes the metalinsulator transition to a lower density obeying $\xi = L_{\phi}$. On the other hand, if $L_{\phi} \ll L$, self-averaging is expected to occur for uncorrelated disorder, such that the effect of disorder can be captured via the impurity-average technique. The SCBA should therefore be reliable if $L_{\phi} \ll L$ and if the disorder is weak (see Sec. II C). Evaluating the *n*-dependent mean free path as $\ell = v_F \tau$ with v_F the Fermi velocity and τ the quasiparticle lifetime, which in the SCBA is given by $\tau = \hbar/[2|\text{Im} \Sigma^{\text{SCBA}}(\mu)|]$, and solving the equation $\xi(n_L) = L_{\phi}$, we extract the localization density n_L plotted in Fig. 8.

For the coupling g = 0.01 Hr, the carrier density at which the metal-insulator transition is expected to occur is lower than n_0 , provided that L_{ϕ} is shorter than $\sim 10^5 a$, i.e., a few micrometers for a band mass equal to the electron mass. Therefore, the possibly to observe deviations from the semiclassical behavior is not seriously limited by the localization phenomenon. The quantum regime is fully reached at a significantly lower density n_c [see Fig. 4(b)], where carriers are expected to be localized unless $L_{\phi} < 10^2 a$, which would be on the scale of nanometers. At the point where $n_L = n_c$, the mean free path $\ell \sim 54a$ is still significantly shorter than L_{ϕ} . Estimating the inelastic scattering time via $L_{\phi} = v_{\rm F} \sqrt{\tau \tau_{\rm inel}}$ [55], we find that $\tau_{\rm inel} \sim 600$ fs when $n_L = n_c$ for a mass equal to the electron mass, which is still much longer than typical values in metals. For the stronger coupling g = 0.1 Hr, the quantum regime is presumably out of reach. We therefore expect that the quantum regime may be reached before the carriers localize in systems with short inelastic scattering time and sufficiently weak impurity scattering, and that our results are relevant in this regime if $L_{\phi} \ll L.$

V. CONCLUSION

We have introduced a microscopic model describing electron interacting with weak pointlike disorder in a magnetic field and solved it for the linear conductivity tensor and the Hall constant in two dimensions. Exact analytical results were derived at zero temperature and low carrier density, while the other regimes were addressed by accurate numerics, using a novel methodology based on piecewise functions. Like in a model studied previously with a phenomenological constant scattering rate, we find a crossover from a semiclassical regime at high density, where Drude-like conductivities are observed, to a low-density quantum regime where they have different functional forms, which at zero temperature are power laws of the density and disorder strength. Unlike in the phenomenological model, however, these power laws are robust to variations of the electron dispersion and change of the spatial dimension. The power laws allow one to define functions of the longitudinal and transverse conductivities that provide direct measures of the carrier density and scattering strength, similar to what the Hall carrier density and the mobility do in the semiclassical regime. We argued that the quantum regime may be within reach of the state-of-the-art field-effect experiments on gated semiconductors.

Our previous study [11] has shown that anisotropy in the electron dispersion enhances the parameter range covered by the quantum regime. Although we have not addressed this question here, we expect a similar effect in the present model. Indeed, we find that for an anisotropic parabolic dispersion with $m_{yy} > m_{xx}$, the crossover density n_c increases by a factor m_{yy}/m_{xx} . The power laws found in this study ultimately originate in the fact that the scattering rate and the interacting DOS vanish as square roots at the bottom of the impurity band. Different local scattering models may lead to different behaviors at the interacting band edge and thus to different power laws. The case of a local Fermi liquid would be worth investigating. This is more difficult than the SCBA treated here, because the Fermi-liquid self-energy develops around the chemical potential and therefore depends in a non-trivial way on the density, while the SCBA self-energy does not. Longer-term perspectives include a multiband generalization of local scattering models, that would enable accurate solutions at low density for systems like graphene. Much more challenging is the generalization to extended disorder or other nonlocal scattering models, for which the vertex corrections cannot be ignored: how to deal accurately with those problems in the low-density limit remains an open question.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are thankful to M. Melegari, A. Morpurgo and N. Prokofiev for fruitful discussions. This work was supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation under Division II (Grant No. 200020-219400).

Appendix A: Fast integral transforms using piecewise functions

Here, using Eq. (11) as an example, we illustrate how the use of piecewise functions enables fast numerical integral transforms. The right-hand side of Eq. (11) is of the form

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \, \frac{f(x)}{z - x},\tag{A1}$$

where the function f(x) plays the role of $(ga)^2 N_0(x)$ and the complex number $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$ plays the role of $\varepsilon - \Sigma^{\text{SCBA}}(\varepsilon)$. Equation (A1) is an example of integral transform of the function f(x), that uses the kernel $\mathscr{K}(x,z) = 1/(z-x)$ and is a generalization of the Hilbert transform. Equations (5), (7), and (8) also involve integral transforms of the functions $N_0(E)$, $\Phi_{xx}(E)$, and $\Phi_{xy}(E)$ using other kernels. Our numerical approach for evaluating these integral transforms is to represent the function to be transformed, e.g., f(x) in Eq. (A1), in a piecewise manner, using in each piece mathematical functions $F_i(x)$ that are sufficiently flexible to capture the behavior of f(x) accurately, and sufficiently simple for the solution of the equation $\frac{d}{dx}\mathscr{F}_i(x,z) = F_i(x)\mathscr{K}(x,z)$ to be known. Thus, the calculation of the integral transform reduces to evaluating $\mathscr{F}_i(x,z)$ at the boundaries of each piece. The approach is useful if the number of pieces is much smaller than the number of function evaluations that would be required to calculate the integral transform using a quadrature. Hence the choice of the functions $F_i(x)$ is crucial. As the functions like $N_0(E)$ that must be piecewiseapproximated can present singularities and non-analyticities, the approach may fail if $F_i(x)$ are just polynomial functions like for instance cubic splines-that can't capture these nonanalytic behaviors accurately.

The DOS of the square-lattice nearest-neighbor tightbinding model is

$$N_0(E) = \frac{1}{\pi^2 a^2 t} K \left(1 - \left(\frac{E}{4t}\right)^2 \right) \theta(4t - |E|),$$
(A2)

where *K* is the complete elliptic integral of the first kind. As it turns out, this function can be represented with $< 10^{-5}$ relative accuracy as a *single* piece,

$$N_0(E) \approx \left(a_0 \ln |E| + \sum_{k=1}^{11} a_k |E|^{k-1} \right) \theta(4t - |E|)$$
 (A3)



FIG. 9. (a) Approximation of the square-lattice tight-binding DOS (dark blue) by elementary mathematical functions (orange). Inset: Relative error of the approximation ($< 10^{-5}$). (b) Integral transform of the DOS versus $z = \varepsilon + i\delta$ for $\delta = 0.1t$. Thick lines are obtained with a quadrature using $N_0(E)$ given by Eq. (A2); thin white lines use a piecewise approximation with $< 10^{-8}$ relative accuracy. Inset: Relative error on the integral transform ($< 10^{-9}$).

with the following numerical parameters:

$$a_0 = -1.013211836423378e-01$$

 $a_1 = 2.809219621590210e-01$
 $a_2 = 2.049497230383165e-04$
 $a_3 = 5.167691304757171e-03$
 $a_4 = -4.729671436113094e-03$
 $a_5 = 3.854466083613651e-03$
 $a_6 = -2.371290515504572e-03$
 $a_7 = 1.017346738868159e-03$
 $a_8 = -2.919228439402373e-04$
 $a_9 = 5.317878986488775e-05$
 $a_{10} = -5.547047143635150e-06$
 $a_{11} = 2.519224597696242e-07$

We use a better approximation with more pieces and $< 10^{-8}$ relative accuracy in our calculations of the conductivities. Figure 9(a) shows a comparison of Eqs. (A2) and (A3). The evaluation of the integral in Eq. (A1) is straightforward for a function like Eq. (A3), because the differential equation

$$\frac{d}{dx}\mathscr{F}(x,z) = \left(a_0 \ln x + \sum_{k=1}^{11} a_k x^{k-1}\right) \frac{1}{z-x}$$
(A4)

admits a closed solution in terms of the second-order polylogarithm Li_2 and the hypergeometric function $_2F_1$:

$$\mathscr{F}(x,z) = -a_0 \left[\ln(x) \ln\left(1 - \frac{x}{z}\right) + \operatorname{Li}_2\left(\frac{x}{z}\right) \right]$$
$$+ \frac{1}{z} \sum_{k=1}^{11} \frac{a_k x^k}{k} {}_2 F_1\left(1,k,k+1,\frac{x}{z}\right). \quad (A5)$$

It follows that the integral transform is reduced to a small number of calls to these special functions:

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dE \frac{N_0(E)}{z-E} \approx \mathscr{F}(4t,z) - \mathscr{F}(0^+,z) - \mathscr{F}(4t,-z) + \mathscr{F}(0^+,-z), \quad (A6)$$

where use has been made of the property $N_0(E) = N_0(-E)$. Figure 9(b) shows a comparison of the integral transform performed by quadratures and without quadrature, using our piecewise approximation of $N_0(E)$ with $< 10^{-8}$ accuracy. The relative error on the integral transform is smaller than the relative error on the DOS.

Appendix B: SCBA self-energy near the band edge

The imaginary part of the SCBA self-energy given by Eq. (11) vanishes at a model-dependent (i.e., $N_0(E)$ - and g-dependent) energy ε_0 that is below and above the non-interacting band edges. We focus on the lower edge for definiteness and investigate the behavior of the self-energy in the vicinity of ε_0 . With the notation $\Sigma^{\text{SCBA}}(\varepsilon) = \Sigma_1(\varepsilon) + i\Sigma_2(\varepsilon)$, we have

$$\Sigma_{1}(\varepsilon) = (ga)^{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dE \frac{N_{0}(E)[\varepsilon - \Sigma_{1}(\varepsilon) - E]}{[\varepsilon - \Sigma_{1}(\varepsilon) - E]^{2} + [\Sigma_{2}(\varepsilon)]^{2}}$$
(B1a)
$$\Sigma_{2}(\varepsilon) = (ga)^{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dE \frac{N_{0}(E)\Sigma_{2}(\varepsilon)}{[\varepsilon - \Sigma_{1}(\varepsilon) - E]^{2} + [\Sigma_{2}(\varepsilon)]^{2}},$$
(B1b)

where it is seen that a factor $\Sigma_2(\varepsilon)$ cancels in the second relation. Setting $\Sigma_2(\varepsilon_0) = 0$ and developing this second relation around $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_0$ gives

$$\frac{1}{(ga)^2} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dE \frac{N_0(E)}{[\varepsilon_0 - \Sigma_1(\varepsilon_0) - E]^2} - 2(\varepsilon - \varepsilon_0)$$
$$\times [1 - \Sigma_1'(\varepsilon_0)] \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dE \frac{N_0(E)}{[\varepsilon_0 - \Sigma_1(\varepsilon_0) - E]^3} + \dots \quad (B2)$$

This development is valid if $\Sigma'_1(\varepsilon_0)$ is finite, which is only true when ε approaches ε_0 from above. On the other hand,

developing Eq. (B1b) around $\Sigma_2(\varepsilon) = 0$, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{(ga)^2} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dE \frac{N_0(E)}{[\varepsilon - \Sigma_1(\varepsilon) - E]^2} - [\Sigma_2(\varepsilon)]^2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dE \frac{N_0(E)}{[\varepsilon - \Sigma_1(\varepsilon) - E]^4} + \dots$$
(B3)

Again, Eq. (B3) is only valid for $\varepsilon > \varepsilon_0$, where $\Sigma_2(\varepsilon)$ approaches zero continuously. Evaluating Eq. (B3) at leading order in $\varepsilon - \varepsilon_0$ and combining with Eq. (B2), we find that $\Sigma_2(\varepsilon)$ varies as a square root close to ε_0 :

$$[\Sigma_2(\varepsilon)]^2 = 2(\varepsilon - \varepsilon_0)[1 - \Sigma_1'(\varepsilon_0)] \frac{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dE \frac{N_0(E)}{[\varepsilon_0 - \Sigma_1(\varepsilon_0) - E]^3}}{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dE \frac{N_0(E)}{[\varepsilon_0 - \Sigma_1(\varepsilon_0) - E]^4}}.$$

Thus $\Sigma_2(\varepsilon) = -C\sqrt{\varepsilon - \varepsilon_0}$ close to a lower band edge, with a model-dependent constant *C* given by

$$C = \sqrt{2[1 - \Sigma_1'(\varepsilon_0)] \frac{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dE \frac{N_0(E)}{[\varepsilon_0 - \Sigma_1(\varepsilon_0) - E]^3}}{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dE \frac{N_0(E)}{[\varepsilon_0 - \Sigma_1(\varepsilon_0) - E]^4}}}.$$
 (B4)

The derivative $\Sigma'_1(\varepsilon)$ is discontinuous at the interacting band edge ε_0 (see below) so the value to be used in Eq. (B4) is the value inside the band.

Below the band edge, where $\Sigma_2(\varepsilon) = 0$, the derivative $\Sigma'_1(\varepsilon)$ may be obtained from Eq. (B1a):

$$\Sigma_1'(\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0) = \frac{1}{1 - \left\{ (ga)^2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dE \, \frac{N_0(E)}{[\varepsilon - \Sigma_1(\varepsilon) - E]^2} \right\}^{-1}}.$$

Furthermore, evaluating Eq. (B1b) at ε_0 with $\Sigma_2(\varepsilon_0) = 0$

- T. Ando, A. B. Fowler, and F. Stern, Electronic properties of two-dimensional systems, Rev. Mod. Phys. 54, 437 (1982).
- [2] A. Tsumura, H. Koezuka, and T. Ando, Macromolecular electronic device: Field-effect transistor with a polythiophene thin film, Appl. Phys. Lett. 49, 1210 (1986).
- [3] K. S. Novoselov, A. K. Geim, S. V. Morozov, D. Jiang, Y. Zhang, S. V. Dubonos, I. V. Grigorieva, and A. A. Firsov, Electric field effect in atomically thin carbon films, Science **306**, 666 (2004).
- [4] S. Manzeli, D. Ovchinnikov, D. Pasquier, O. V. Yazyev, and A. Kis, 2D transition metal dichalcogenides, Nature Reviews Materials 2, 17033 (2017).
- [5] Y. Cao, V. Fatemi, S. Fang, K. Watanabe, T. Taniguchi, E. Kaxiras, and P. Jarillo-Herrero, Unconventional superconductivity in magic-angle graphene superlattices, Nature 556, 43 (2018).
- [6] E. Y. Andrei, D. K. Efetov, P. Jarillo-Herrero, A. H. MacDonald, K. F. Mak, T. Senthil, E. Tutuc, A. Yazdani, and A. F. Young, The marvels of moiré materials, Nat. Rev. Mat. 6, 201 (2021).
- [7] T. Kopp and J. Mannhart, Calculation of the capacitances of

gives the relation

$$1 = (ga)^2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dE \, \frac{N_0(E)}{[\varepsilon_0 - \Sigma_1(\varepsilon_0) - E]^2}.$$

These two expressions show that $\Sigma'_1(\varepsilon)$ diverges when ε approaches ε_0 from below, as the quantity in curly braces approaches one.

For the parabolic dispersion, the implicit relation Eq. (16) allows one to extract closed expressions for ε_0 and *C*. We start by expanding Eq. (16) in power of $\Sigma_2(\varepsilon)$, as appropriate for $\varepsilon \gtrsim \varepsilon_0$, up to second order. The imaginary part of this expansion yields a second-order algebraic equation for $\Sigma_1(\varepsilon)$, whose solution is

$$\Sigma_1(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon + \frac{E_c}{2} \left(\sqrt{1+\gamma} - 1 \right), \tag{B5}$$

where $\gamma = 4(ga)^2 N_0/E_c$. This shows that $\Sigma_1(\varepsilon)$ increases linearly for $\varepsilon \gtrsim \varepsilon_0$, as seen in Figs. 2 and 3. As the self-energy is continuous at ε_0 , we can deduce expressions for $\Sigma_1(\varepsilon_0)$ and $\varepsilon_0 - \Sigma_1(\varepsilon_0)$, that we insert back into Eq. (16), together with $\Sigma_2(\varepsilon_0) = 0$, to get

$$\varepsilon_{0} + \frac{E_{c}}{2} \left(\sqrt{1+\gamma} - 1 \right) = (ga)^{2} N_{0} \left\{ \ln \left[\frac{E_{c}}{2} \left(\sqrt{1+\gamma} - 1 \right) \right] - \ln \left[\frac{E_{c}}{2} \left(\sqrt{1+\gamma} - 1 \right) + E_{c} \right] \right\}.$$

Solving for ε_0 , we obtain Eq. (17a). On the other hand, the real part of the expansion of Eq. (16), complemented with the expression of ε_0 , yields a equation for $[\Sigma_2(\varepsilon)]^2$, whose solution is

$$\Sigma_2(\varepsilon) = -\frac{\sqrt{E_c \gamma/2}}{(1+\gamma)^{1/4}} \sqrt{\varepsilon - \varepsilon_0}, \tag{B6}$$

which leads to Eq. (17b).

conductors: Perspectives for the optimization of electronic devices, J. Appl. Phys. **106**, 064504 (2009).

- [8] J. V. Li, A. M. Nardes, Z. Liang, S. E. Shaheen, B. A. Gregg, and D. H. Levi, Simultaneous measurement of carrier density and mobility of organic semiconductors using capacitance techniques, Org. Electron. 12, 1879 (2011).
- [9] T. Fukuzawa, M. Koshino, and T. Ando, Weak-field Hall effect in graphene calculated within self-consistent Born approximation, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn 78, 094714 (2009).
- [10] M. Noro and T. Ando, Weak-field Hall effect in graphene with long-range scatterers, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn 85, 014708 (2016).
- [11] G. Morpurgo, L. Rademaker, C. Berthod, and T. Giamarchi, Hall response of locally correlated two-dimensional electrons at low density, Phys. Rev. Research **6**, 013112 (2024).
- [12] H. Zhang, C. Berthod, H. Berger, T. Giamarchi, and A. F. Morpurgo, Band filling and cross quantum capacitance in ion-gated semiconducting transition metal dichalcogenide monolayers, Nano Lett. 19, 8836 (2019).
- [13] C. Berthod, H. Zhang, A. F. Morpurgo, and T. Giamarchi,

Theory of cross quantum capacitance, Phys. Rev. Research **3**, 043036 (2021).

- [14] H. H. Choi, Y. I. Rodionov, A. F. Paterson, J. Panidi, D. Saranin, N. Kharlamov, S. I. Didenko, T. D. Anthopoulos, K. Cho, and V. Podzorov, Accurate extraction of charge carrier mobility in 4probe field-effect transistors, Adv. Funct. Mater. 28, 1707105 (2018).
- [15] J. Ziman, *Electrons and Phonons: The Theory of Transport Phenomena in Solids* (Oxford University Press, 2001).
- [16] H. Fukuyama, H. Ebisawa, and Y. Wada, Theory of Hall effect.I: Nearly free electron, Prog. Theor. Phys. 42, 494 (1969).
- [17] H. Fukuyama, Theory of Hall effect. II: Bloch electrons, Prog. Theor. Phys. 42, 1284 (1969).
- [18] M. Itoh, The Hall effect in the ladder approximation, J. Phys-Condens. Mat. 2, 5357 (1990).
- [19] M. Khodas and A. M. Finkel'stein, Hall coefficient in an interacting electron gas, Phys. Rev. B 68, 155114 (2003).
- [20] J. Kovačević, M. Ferrero, and J. Vučičević, Towards numerically exact computation of conductivity in the thermodynamic limit of interacting lattice models, arXiv:2501.19118 (2025).
- [21] P. Prelovšek and X. Zotos, Reactive Hall constant of strongly correlated electrons, Phys. Rev. B 64, 235114 (2001).
- [22] A. Auerbach, Hall number of strongly correlated metals, Phys. Rev. Lett. 121, 066601 (2018).
- [23] H. E. Castillo and C. A. Balseiro, Hall conductivity and Fermi surface in highly correlated systems, Phys. Rev. Lett. 68, 121 (1992).
- [24] F. F. Assaad and M. Imada, Hall coefficient for the twodimensional Hubbard model, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, 3868 (1995).
- [25] W. O. Wang, J. K. Ding, B. Moritz, E. W. Huang, and T. P. Devereaux, DC Hall coefficient of the strongly correlated Hubbard model, npj Quantum Materials 5, 51 (2020).
- [26] T. Pruschke, M. Jarrell, and J. Freericks, Anomalous normalstate properties of high-*T_c* superconductors: intrinsic properties of strongly correlated electron systems?, Adv. Phys. 44, 187 (1995).
- [27] A. A. Markov, G. Rohringer, and A. N. Rubtsov, Robustness of the topological quantization of the Hall conductivity for correlated lattice electrons at finite temperatures, Phys. Rev. B 100, 115102 (2019).
- [28] J. Vučičević and R. Žitko, Electrical conductivity in the Hubbard model: Orbital effects of magnetic field, Phys. Rev. B 104, 205101 (2021).
- [29] S. M. Manning and Y. Chen, The Hall effect in the normal state of the *t*–*J* model, J. Phys-Condens. Mat. **5**, L23 (1993).
- [30] H. Kontani, K. Kanki, and K. Ueda, Hall effect and resistivity in high-*T_c* superconductors: The conserving approximation, Phys. Rev. B **59**, 14723 (1999).
- [31] H. Kontani, Theory of infrared Hall conductivity based on the Fermi liquid theory: Analysis of high-*T_c* superconductors, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn **76**, 074707 (2007).
- [32] J. Mitscherling and W. Metzner, Longitudinal conductivity and Hall coefficient in two-dimensional metals with spiral magnetic order, Phys. Rev. B **98**, 195126 (2018).
- [33] G. León and T. Giamarchi, Hall effect in quasi one-dimensional organic conductors, J. Phys. F Met. Phys. 142, 315 (2006).
- [34] G. León, C. Berthod, and T. Giamarchi, Hall effect in strongly correlated low-dimensional systems, Phys. Rev. B 75, 195123 (2007).
- [35] G. León, C. Berthod, T. Giamarchi, and A. J. Millis, Hall effect on the triangular lattice, Phys. Rev. B 78, 085105 (2008).

- [36] M. Filippone, C.-E. Bardyn, S. Greschner, and T. Giamarchi, Vanishing Hall response of charged fermions in a transverse magnetic field, Phys. Rev. Lett. **123**, 086803 (2019).
- [37] S. Greschner, M. Filippone, and T. Giamarchi, Universal Hall response in interacting quantum systems, Phys. Rev. Lett. 122, 083402 (2019).
- [38] M. Buser, S. Greschner, U. Schollwöck, and T. Giamarchi, Probing the Hall voltage in synthetic quantum systems, Phys. Rev. Lett. 126, 030501 (2021).
- [39] A. Khurana, Electrical conductivity in the infinite-dimensional Hubbard model, Phys. Rev. Lett. 64, 1990 (1990).
- [40] S. Liu, Nonlocal conductivities and dielectric functions of free electron gas with impurity scattering, Ann. Phys. New York 59, 165 (1970).
- [41] H. Fukuyama, Hall effect in two-dimensional disordered systems, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn 49, 644 (1980).
- [42] T. Ando, Bilayer graphene with long-range scatterers: Diamagnetism and weak-field Hall effect, Physica E 58, 6 (2014).
- [43] M. Pickem, E. Maggio, and J. M. Tomczak, Prototypical manybody signatures in transport properties of semiconductors, Phys. Rev. B 105, 085139 (2022).
- [44] H. Bruus and K. Flensberg, Many-Body Quantum Theory in Condensed Matter Physics : An Introduction (Oxford University Press, 2016).
- [45] C. Berthod, *Spectroscopic Probes of Quantum Matter* (IOP Publishing, 2018).
- [46] C. Berthod, Piecewise: Flexible piecewise functions for fast integral transforms in Julia, https://github.com/ ChristopheBerthod/Piecewise.jl (2025).
- [47] C. Berthod, Linear magneto-transport with a local self-energy in Julia, https://github.com/ChristopheBerthod/ MagnetoTransport.jl (2025).
- [48] As –Im Σ(ε) must remain strictly positive for causality reasons, an infinitesimal shift i0 must in principle be inserted in Eq. (11), such that Im Σ^{SCBA}(ε) is never strictly zero.
- [49] M. Yamagishi, J. Soeda, T. Uemura, Y. Okada, Y. Takatsuki, T. Nishikawa, Y. Nakazawa, I. Doi, K. Takimiya, and J. Takeya, Free-electron-like Hall effect in high-mobility organic thinfilm transistors, Phys. Rev. B 81, 161306 (2010).
- [50] T. Uemura, M. Yamagishi, J. Soeda, Y. Takatsuki, Y. Okada, Y. Nakazawa, and J. Takeya, Temperature dependence of the Hall effect in pentacene field-effect transistors: Possibility of charge decoherence induced by molecular fluctuations, Phys. Rev. B 85, 035313 (2012).
- [51] N. R. Pradhan, D. Rhodes, S. Memaran, J. M. Poumirol, D. Smirnov, S. Talapatra, S. Feng, N. Perea-Lopez, A. L. Elias, M. Terrones, P. M. Ajayan, and L. Balicas, Hall and field-effect mobilities in few layered *p*-WSe₂ field-effect transistors, Sci. Rep. UK 5, 8979 (2015).
- [52] M. Masseroni, M. Gull, A. Panigrahi, N. Jacobsen, F. Fischer, C. Tong, J. D. Gerber, M. Niese, T. Taniguchi, K. Watanabe, L. Levitov, T. Ihn, K. Ensslin, and H. Duprez, Spin-orbit proximity in MoS₂/bilayer graphene heterostructures, Nature Communications 15, 9251 (2024).
- [53] I. Gutiérrez-Lezama, N. Ubrig, E. Ponomarev, and A. F. Morpurgo, Ionic gate spectroscopy of 2D semiconductors, Nat. Rev. Phys. 3, 508 (2021).
- [54] P. W. Anderson, Absence of diffusion in certain random lattices, Phys. Rev. 109, 1492 (1958).
- [55] P. A. Lee and T. V. Ramakrishnan, Disordered electronic systems, Rev. Mod. Phys. 57, 287 (1985).