

Transport phenomena in three-dimensional system close to the magnetic quantum critical point: The conserving approximation with the current vertex corrections

Seiichiro Onari, Hiroshi Kontani¹, and Yukio Tanaka

Department of Applied Physics, Nagoya University, Chikusa, Nagoya 464-8603, Japan. and

¹Department of Physics, Nagoya University, Chikusa, Nagoya 464-8603, Japan.

(Dated: November 9, 2018)

It is known that various transport coefficients strongly deviate from conventional Fermi-liquid behaviors in many electron systems which are close to antiferromagnetic (AF) quantum critical points (QCP). For example, Hall coefficients and Nernst coefficients in three-dimensional heavy fermion CeCoIn₅ and CeCu_{6-x}Au_x increase strikingly at low temperatures, whose overall behaviors are similar to those in high- T_c cuprates. These temperature dependences are too strong to explain in terms of the relaxation time approximation. To elucidate the origin of these anomalous transport phenomena in three-dimensional systems, we study the current vertex corrections (CVC) based on the fluctuation exchange (FLEX) approximation, and find out decisive role of the CVC. The main finding of the present paper is that the Hall coefficient and the Nernst coefficient strongly increase thanks to the CVC in the vicinity of the AF QCP, irrespective of dimensionality. We also study the relaxation time of quasi-particles, and find that “hot points” and “cold lines” are formed in general three-dimensional systems due to strong AF fluctuations.

PACS numbers: 72.10.Bg, 71.27.+a

I. INTRODUCTION

Strongly correlated electron systems close to the quantum critical point (QCP) have stimulated much interest. Especially, heavy fermion compound CeCoIn₅,¹ which is a three-dimensional metal close to the antiferromagnetic (AF) QCP, attracts much attention because of the non-Fermi-liquid normal state and the d -wave superconductivity ($T_c = 2.3\text{K}$). Moreover, recent experimental efforts have revealed the existence of interesting anomalous transport phenomena characteristic of the AF QCP. In the normal state of CeCoIn₅, for example, it is observed that the resistivity² $\rho \propto T$, the Hall coefficient² $R_H \propto 1/T$, and the Nernst coefficient³ $\nu \propto 1/T$ below 20K till $T_c = 2.3\text{K}$. These behaviors are quite different from the normal Fermi-liquid behaviors, $\rho \propto T^2$ and $R_H \propto T^0$.

In Ce115, the maximum values of R_H and ν are quite huge compared to values for high temperatures. The maximum value of R_H becomes about 30 times larger than the values at high temperatures. The value of ν reaches $-1.0\mu\text{V}/\text{KT}$ at 5K, whose magnitude is about 1000 times larger than the values in usual metals. The temperature dependence of R_H is similar to the two-dimensional high- T_c cuprates above the pseudo-gap temperatures, and that of ν is similar to electron doped high- T_c cuprates, irrespective of signs. Moreover, the magnitude of R_H and ν in CeCoIn₅ is much larger than that in high- T_c cuprates. Similar drastic increases of R_H are also observed in CeCu_{6-x}Au_x⁴ and YbRh₂Si₂⁵, which are three-dimensional heavy fermion compounds close to the AF QCP.

The relaxation time approximation (RTA)^{6,7} has been used frequently in the study of transport phenomena, although its reliability for strongly correlated systems is not assured. According to the spin fluctuation theory, the

relaxation time $\tau_{\mathbf{k}}$ becomes strongly anisotropic.^{6,8} The spots on the Fermi surface where $\tau_{\mathbf{k}}$ takes the maximum (minimum) value is denoted by the cold (hot) spots in literatures. The ratio of the relaxation time at cold spots and hot spots $r = \tau_{\text{cold}}/\tau_{\text{hot}}$ and the weight of the cold spots play an important role in the transport phenomena. However, in terms of the RTA, an unrealistic huge r (say $r = 100\text{-}1000$) is required to reproduce the experimental enhancement of R_H in CeCoIn₅.² If we assume that R_H is enhanced by this mechanism, R_H should be suppressed quite sensitively by a very small amount of impurity. In addition, when $r \gg 1$, the magnetoresistance should be too large to explain the modified Kohler's rule, $\Delta\rho/\rho \propto R_H^2/\rho^2$, which is observed in high- T_c cuprates^{9,10} and in CeCoIn₅.²

These anomalous transport phenomena close to the AF QCP are well reproduced by taking the current vertex corrections (CVC) into account. Actually, the CVC is necessary to satisfy conservation laws. In the Fermi liquid theory, the CVC corresponds to the back-flow, which naturally arises from electron-electron correlations. Then, the CVC is indispensable to calculate the transport coefficients in the strongly correlated electron systems, where electron-electron correlations are dominant. For example, the modified Kohler's rule is explained due to the CVC caused by the AF fluctuations.¹¹ The negative R_H in electron doped high- T_c cuprates, which cannot be explained by the RTA because the Fermi surface is hole-like everywhere, is explained if we take the CVC. Moreover, it is not easy to explain the enhancement of ν by the RTA because the Sondheimer cancellation¹² makes ν small. The enhancement of ν in electron-doped (hole-doped) high- T_c cuprates are caused by the CVC due to the AF (AF and superconducting) fluctuations.

Until now, various non-Fermi-liquid behaviors of high- T_c cuprates have been explained by the spin fluctu-

ation model, such as the self-consistent renormalization (SCR) theory^{13,14,15} and the fluctuation exchange (FLEX) theory^{16,17,18}. For example, an appropriate behavior of the spin susceptibility and the AF correlation length ξ ($\xi^2 \propto 1/T$) are obtained. Moreover, spin-fluctuation theories^{6,15} derive the relation $\rho \propto T^2 \xi^2$, which is consistent with the non-Fermi-liquid behaviors of high- T_c cuprates close to the AF QCP. Based on the spin fluctuation theory, Kontani *et al.*^{11,19,20,21} have developed a theory of transport phenomena, by focusing on crucial role of the CVC. This framework naturally reproduces the temperature dependence of transport coefficients for high- T_c cuprates and other 2D systems²² close to the QCP.

In high- T_c cuprates¹⁹, the CVC plays an important role on transport phenomena. However, it is highly non-trivial whether the CVC is significant in three-dimensional systems, since the CVC totally vanishes in the dynamical mean field theory (DMFT) where $d = \infty$ limit is taken.^{23,24} The reason is that the irreducible four-point vertex Γ^I in the DMFT becomes a local function, which cannot contribute to the CVC. Although it is generally believed that the DMFT works well in various 3D systems with strong correlation,²³ the momentum dependences of the self-energy and the vertex corrections are significant near the QCP. However, we must consider the CVC which cannot be taken into account within the DMFT. To elucidate this issue, we study the role of the CVC based on the AF fluctuation theory in three-dimensional systems.

The purpose of this paper is to examine whether non-Fermi-liquid behaviors in 3D systems can be explained by taking account of the CVC in terms of the FLEX approximation. In 3D systems, massive calculation resource and time are needed to perform the calculation. We show that striking increase of R_H and ν can be obtained at low temperatures even in 3D by virtue of the CVC, which is consistent with experiments in CeCoIn₅ and CeCu_{6-x}Au_x. The present study is the first microscopic calculation for the Hall coefficient and the Nernst coefficient in 3D with the CVC. We also find that in 3D systems, the hot and cold spots form point-like (“hot points”) and line-like shape (“cold lines”), respectively. The CVC on the cold lines plays a major role for increasing R_H and ν .

II. FORMULATION

A. Model

We first introduce the three-dimensional Hubbard model,

$$\mathcal{H} = - \sum_{i,j} \sum_{\sigma} t_{ij} c_{i\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{j\sigma} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,\sigma} U n_{i\sigma} n_{i-\sigma} \quad (1)$$

on a stacked square lattice with the Coulomb repulsion U and the intralayer hopping t_1 , t_2 , t_3 and the interlayer

hopping t_z depicted in Fig. 1. Hereafter, we take $t_1 = 1$ as a unit of energy.




FIG. 1: The lattice structure with the nearest intralayer hopping t_1 , the second one t_2 , the third one t_3 and the interlayer hopping t_z

Then, the dispersion is derived as,

$$\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^0 = -2t_1(\cos(k_x) + \cos(k_y)) - 4t_2 \cos(k_x) \cos(k_y) - 2t_3(\cos(2k_x) + \cos(2k_y)) - 2t_z \cos(k_z). \quad (2)$$

We apply the FLEX approximation^{16,17,25,26} where the Green's function, the self-energy and the susceptibility are obtained self-consistently. The FLEX approximation belongs to “conserving approximations” formulated by Baym and Kadanoff^{27,28}. The spin ($\chi_{\mathbf{q}}^s$) and charge ($\chi_{\mathbf{q}}^c$) susceptibilities are

$$\chi_{\mathbf{q}}^s(\omega_l) = \frac{\chi_{\mathbf{q}}^0(\omega_l)}{1 - U \chi_{\mathbf{q}}^0(\omega_l)}, \quad (3)$$

$$\chi_{\mathbf{q}}^c(\omega_l) = \frac{\chi_{\mathbf{q}}^0(\omega_l)}{1 + U \chi_{\mathbf{q}}^0(\omega_l)}, \quad (4)$$

and the irreducible susceptibility $\chi_{\mathbf{q}}^0$ is

$$\chi_{\mathbf{q}}^0(\omega_l) = -\frac{T}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k},n} G_{\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{k}}(\omega_l + \epsilon_n) G_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon_n), \quad (5)$$

where Matsubara frequencies are denoted by $\epsilon_n = (2n + 1)\pi T$ and $\omega_l = 2l\pi T$, respectively.

The self-energy is given by

$$\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon_n) = \frac{T}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{q},l} G_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}}(\epsilon_n - \omega_l) V_{\mathbf{q}}(\omega_l), \quad (6)$$

where the effective interaction $V_{\mathbf{q}}$ is

$$V_{\mathbf{q}}(\omega_l) = U^2 \left(\frac{3}{2} \chi_{\mathbf{q}}^s(\omega_l) + \frac{1}{2} \chi_{\mathbf{q}}^c(\omega_l) - \chi_{\mathbf{q}}^0(\omega_l) \right) + U. \quad (7)$$

We calculate Green's function self-consistently with Dyson's equation,

$$G_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon_n)^{-1} = i\epsilon_n + \mu - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^0 - \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon_n). \quad (8)$$

The irreducible particle-hole vertex $\Gamma_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^I$, which satisfies $\Gamma_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^I(\epsilon_n, \epsilon_{n'}) = \delta\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon_n)/\delta G_{\mathbf{k}'}(\epsilon_{n'})$ is given by

$$\Gamma_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^I(\epsilon_n, \epsilon_{n'}) = V_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}'}(\epsilon_n - \epsilon_{n'}) \quad (9)$$

where the Maki-Thompson term is taken into account and the Aslamazov-Larkin term is omitted because the latter is negligible for the CVC.¹⁹

In this paper we take $N = N_x \times N_y \times N_z = 64 \times 64 \times 32$ \mathbf{k} -point meshes and the Matsubara frequencies ϵ_n takes the value from $-(2N_c - 1)\pi T$ to $(2N_c - 1)\pi T$ with $N_c = 256$.

B. conductivity

In order to derive the transport coefficient, we begin with Kubo formula,

$$\sigma_{\mu\nu} = e^2 \sum_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'\sigma\sigma'} v_{\mathbf{k}\mu}^0 v_{\mathbf{k}'\nu}^0 \frac{\text{Im}K_{\mathbf{k}\sigma, \mathbf{k}'\sigma'}(\omega + i\delta)}{\omega} \Big|_{\omega=0}, \quad (10)$$

where $K(\omega + i\delta)$ is analytic continuation of below $K(i\omega_n)$

$$K_{\mathbf{k}\sigma, \mathbf{k}'\sigma'}(i\omega_n) = \int_0^\beta d\tau e^{\omega_n \tau} \times \left\langle T_\tau \left\{ c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}^\dagger(\tau) c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}(\tau) c_{\mathbf{k}'\sigma'}^\dagger(\tau) c_{\mathbf{k}'\sigma'}(\tau) \right\} \right\rangle \quad (11)$$

and

$$v_{\mathbf{k}\mu}^0 = \frac{\partial \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^0}{\partial k_\mu}. \quad (12)$$

Eliashberg²⁹ derived the conductivity in this way. By generalizing Eliashberg's theory^{19,22} the conductivity is obtained as

$$\sigma_{xx} = e^2 \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \int \frac{d\epsilon}{\pi} \left(-\frac{\partial f}{\partial \epsilon} \right) \left\{ v_{\mathbf{k}x}(\epsilon) |G_{\mathbf{k}}^R(\epsilon)|^2 J_{\mathbf{k}x}(\epsilon) - \text{Re}[G_{\mathbf{k}}^R(\epsilon)^2] v_{\mathbf{k}x}(\epsilon)^2 \right\}, \quad (13)$$

$$\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon) = \nabla[\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^0 + \text{Re}\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon)], \quad (14)$$

where $\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}$ is the quasi-particle velocity (without Z -factor) and the retarded Green's function $G_{\mathbf{k}}^R(\epsilon)$ is derived by the analytic continuation. The total current $\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{k}}$ is given by the Bethe-Salpeter equation

$$\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon) = \mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon) + \sum_{\mathbf{k}'} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\epsilon'}{4\pi i} \mathcal{T}_{22}^I(\mathbf{k}\epsilon, \mathbf{k}'\epsilon') |G_{\mathbf{k}'}^R(\epsilon')|^2 \mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{k}'}(\epsilon'), \quad (15)$$

which is based on the Ward identity. The irreducible four-point vertex $\mathcal{T}_{lm}^I(\mathbf{k}\epsilon, \mathbf{k}'\epsilon')$ is defined in Ref. 29. According to eq. (9), it is given by

$$\mathcal{T}_{22}^I(\mathbf{k}\epsilon, \mathbf{k}'\epsilon') = \left(\cotanh \frac{\epsilon' - \epsilon}{2T} - \tanh \frac{\epsilon'}{2T} \right) \times 2i \text{Im}V_{\mathbf{k}'-\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon' - \epsilon + i\delta). \quad (16)$$

C. Hall coefficient

When a weak magnetic field B is induced along z axis, the Hall coefficient R_H is given by

$$R_H = \frac{\sigma_{xy}/B}{\sigma_{xx}\sigma_{yy}}. \quad (17)$$

The Hall conductivity σ_{xy} is obtained by^{19,30}

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{xy}/B &= -e^3 \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \int \frac{d\epsilon}{2\pi} \left(-\frac{\partial f}{\partial \epsilon} \right) \\ &\quad |\text{Im}G_{\mathbf{k}}^R(\epsilon)| |G_{\mathbf{k}}^R(\epsilon)|^2 A_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon), \quad (18) \\ A_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon) &= v_{\mathbf{k}x}(\epsilon) \left[J_{\mathbf{k}x}(\epsilon) \frac{\partial J_{\mathbf{k}y}(\epsilon)}{\partial k_y} - J_{\mathbf{k}y}(\epsilon) \frac{\partial J_{\mathbf{k}x}(\epsilon)}{\partial k_y} \right] \\ &\quad + \langle x \leftrightarrow y \rangle, \quad (19) \end{aligned}$$

where $f(\epsilon) = 1/(\exp(\epsilon/T) + 1)$.

D. Nernst effect

Nernst coefficient under a weak magnetic field B along z axis and gradient of temperature along x axis is defined as

$$\nu = \frac{-E_y}{B\partial_x T}. \quad (20)$$

According to the linear response theory³¹, the response function $L_{\mu\nu}^{21}$ is defined as

$$L_{\mu\nu}^{21}(i\omega_l) = -\frac{T}{\omega_l} \int_0^\beta d\tau e^{i\omega_l \tau} \langle T_\tau j_\mu^Q(\tau) j_\nu(\tau=0) \rangle. \quad (21)$$

The electron current operator \mathbf{j} and the heat current operator \mathbf{j}^Q are given by

$$\mathbf{j} = e \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma} v_{\mathbf{k}}^0 c_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma}, \quad (22)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{j}^Q(\omega_l) &= \lim_{\tau' \rightarrow \tau} \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma} \int_0^\beta d\tau e^{i\omega_l \tau} \\ &\quad \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau'} \right) c_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma}^\dagger(\tau) c_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma}(\tau') \quad (23) \\ &= \frac{T}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}, n, \sigma} i(\epsilon_n + \omega_l/2) v_{\mathbf{k}}^0 c_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma}^\dagger(\epsilon_n) c_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma}(\epsilon_n + \omega_l) \quad (24) \end{aligned}$$

respectively.

After the analytic continuation for eq. (21), L_{xx}^{21} and L_{xy}^{21} are obtained as³²

$$\begin{aligned} L_{xx}^{21}(+i\delta) &= eT \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \int \frac{d\epsilon}{\pi} \left(-\frac{\partial f}{\partial \epsilon} \right) \mathbf{q}_{\mathbf{k}x}(\epsilon) \\ &\quad \times \left\{ |G_{\mathbf{k}}^R(\epsilon)|^2 J_{\mathbf{k}x}(\epsilon) - \text{Re}[G_{\mathbf{k}}^R(\epsilon)^2] v_{\mathbf{k}x}(\epsilon) \right\} \quad (25) \end{aligned}$$

$$L_{xy}^{21(+i\delta)} = BT e^2 \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \int \frac{d\epsilon}{\pi} \left(-\frac{\partial f}{\partial \epsilon} \right) \times |\text{Im} G_{\mathbf{k}}^R(\epsilon)| |G_{\mathbf{k}}^R(\epsilon)|^2 A'_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon), \quad (26)$$

$$\gamma_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon) = -\text{Im} \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon), \quad (27)$$

$$A'_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon) = \gamma_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon) \left\{ \mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon) \times [\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon) \times \nabla]_z \left[\frac{\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon)}{\gamma_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon)} \right] \right\}_z \quad (28)$$

$$\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon) = \mathbf{q}_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon) + \sum_{\mathbf{k}'} \int \frac{d\epsilon'}{4\pi i} \times \mathcal{T}_{22}^{-1}(\mathbf{k}\epsilon, \mathbf{k}'\epsilon') |G_{\mathbf{k}'}^R(\epsilon')|^2 \mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{k}'}(\epsilon'), \quad (29)$$

where $\mathbf{q}_{\mathbf{k}}$ is the quasi-particle heat velocity $\mathbf{q}_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon) = \epsilon \mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon)$.

Using above expressions, ν can be rewritten as

$$\nu = \frac{L_{xy}^{21}}{BT^2 \sigma_{xx}} - \frac{S \sigma_{xy}}{B \sigma_{xx}}, \quad (30)$$

where the thermopower S is given by

$$S = \frac{1}{T^2} \frac{L_{xx}^{21}}{\sigma_{xx}}. \quad (31)$$

III. RESULT

Here, we show numerical results obtained by the CVC-FLEX approximation. We use filling $n = 0.9$ ($n = 1$ corresponds to half filling) and the intralayer hopping parameters $t_1 = 1$, $t_2 = -1/6$ and $t_3 = 1/5$ which reproduce the Fermi surface of 2D high- T_c cuprate YBCO, and introduce the interlayer hopping t_z which makes the Fermi surface three-dimensional. The Stoner factor $\alpha_S = \max \{ U \chi_{\mathbf{q}}^0(\omega = 0) \}$ represents the “distance” from the AF order ($\alpha_S = 1$ corresponds to the boundary of the AF or the spin density wave (SDW) order) since the denominator of the static spin susceptibility is $1 - U \chi^0$. We calculate for each t_z with keeping α_S , by tuning the value of U as shown by solid line for $\alpha_S = 0.995$ and dotted line for $\alpha_S = 0.998$ at $T = 0.02$ in Fig. 2. The “distance” from the AF order is considered to be same along these lines. Note that $\alpha_S < 1$ is always satisfied in 2D ($t_z = 0$) at finite temperatures reflecting the theory of Mermin-Wagner.³³

Fig. 3 shows the Fermi surface for $t_z = 0$ (2D), $t_z = 0.4$ (quasi-3D; q3D) and $t_z = 0.8$ (3D). We see that three dimensionality becomes stronger as the value of t_z increases. The \mathbf{k} -dependence of the static spin susceptibility $\chi_{\mathbf{k}}^s$ is shown in Fig. 4, where the peak position is commensurate; $(k_x, k_y) = (\pi, \pi)$ for $t_z = 0$ (2D), $(k_x, k_y, k_z) = (\pi, \pi, \pi)$ for $t_z = 0.4$ (q3D) and incommensurate around (π, π, π) for $t_z = 0.8$ (3D). From these peak structures, we ensure that the AF fluctuations are dominant in these systems. In this case, the peak values of χ^s increase with t_z as seen in Fig. 5. This means that the present system approaches to the AF instability as the dimensionality changes from 2D to 3D.




FIG. 2: U against t_z for $\alpha_S = 0.995$ (solid line) and $\alpha_S = 0.998$ (dotted line) at $T = 0.02$.

To understand 3D structure of the relaxation time τ , we show the \mathbf{k} -dependence of $\gamma_{\mathbf{k}} (= -\text{Im} \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon = 0)) \propto 1/\tau_{\mathbf{k}}$ along the Fermi surface in Figs. 6-8, where hot spots are depicted by circles and cold spots are illustrated by dotted circle. The bottom panels represent the momentum dependence of $\gamma_{\mathbf{k}}$ along the Fermi surface for each k_z . We see the hot spots exist on the plains of $k_z = 0$ and $k_z = \pi/4$ for $t_z = 0.4$ and $t_z = 0.8$, respectively.

The volume fraction of hot spots decreases as t_z increases, and for three-dimensional case ($t_z = 0.8$) hot spots have point-like structure (“hot points”), which is consistent with the experimental result obtained by de Haas-van Alphen measurements on CeIn₃.³⁴ Generally in 3D systems, nesting exists in only small parts of the Fermi surface, and hot spots form there. In general, the “hot lines”⁷ where hot spots form line-like structure would not be appropriate in 3D systems.

On the other hand, $\gamma_{\mathbf{k}}$ increases more sharply along k_{\parallel} direction than k_z direction around minimum point of $\gamma_{\mathbf{k}}$ for $t_z = 0.4$ and 0.8 as depicted in Fig. 7 and Fig. 8. In this sense, cold spots stretch strikingly along k_z direction. Then, cold spots form line-like structure (“cold lines”). They are aligned perpendicular to the plain with hot spots. The formation of hot points and cold lines would be generally expected in three-dimensional systems. To confirm the generality, we must study much more systems with various types of 3D Fermi surfaces.

The calculated temperature dependence of the resistivity $\rho = 1/\sigma_{xx}$ for $t_z = 0$ (2D), $t_z = 0.4$ (q3D) and $t_z = 0.8$ (3D) with $U = 9.4$, $U = 6.2$ and $U = 5.2$, respectively (see Fig. 2), are shown in Fig. 9, where the unit of ρ is $\frac{\hbar a_c}{e^2} \sim 2.4 \times 10^{-6} \Omega \text{m}$ for a bilayer YBCO (lattice constant along c axis: $a_c = 5.8 \times 10^{-10} \text{m}$) and $3.1 \times 10^{-6} \Omega \text{m}$ for CeCoIn₅ ($a_c = 7.6 \times 10^{-10} \text{m}$), respectively. The value of U is chosen to satisfy $\alpha_S = 0.995$ at $T = 0.02$ for each case. In this case, the “distance” from the AF QCP is the same among three t_z parameters. We see that, independently of the dimensionality, the resistivities with and without the CVC are proportional to the temperature.




FIG. 3: Fermi surface for 2D with $t_z = 0$ (upper panel), q3D with $t_z = 0.4$ (lower left panel) and 3D with $t_z = 0.8$ (lower right panel) for $T = 0.02$, $\alpha_S = 0.995$.




FIG. 4: The spin susceptibility for $t_z = 0$ (left panel), 0.4 (middle panel) with $k_z = \pi$, 0.8 (right panel) with $k_z = \pi$, for $\alpha_S = 0.995$, $T = 0.02$.




FIG. 5: The temperature dependence of the peak value of spin susceptibility for $t_z = 0, 0.4, 0.8$, in the condition of $\alpha_S = 0.995$ at $T = 0.02$.




FIG. 6: γ along the Fermi surface for $t_z = 0$, $\alpha_S = 0.995$ at $T = 0.02$, where the hot spots and cold spots are depicted by solid circles and dotted circle, respectively.

Then, the value of ρ is slightly enhanced by the CVC. It decreases as t_z increases since the corresponding value of U is reduced. This T -linear behavior of the resistivity is consistent with experiments for the systems close to the AF QCP, such as two-dimensional high- T_c cuprate and three-dimensional CeCoIn_5 ². In detail, the resistivities with the CVC show sub-linear temperature dependence in low temperatures, which are also observed in the experimental results for heavy fermion CeRhIn_5 (private discussion). According to the SCR theory,^{15,35} the resistivity behaves as $\rho \propto T$ in 2D, and $\rho \propto T^{3/2}$ in 3D. However, the SCR theory also predicts that $\rho \propto T$ for a wide range of temperatures even in 3D systems when the system is close to the AF QCP, which is consistent with the present numerical calculation.

Next, we show the temperature dependence of the Hall coefficient R_H in Fig. 10, where the unit of R_H is $\frac{a_a a_b a_c}{e} \sim 5.2 \times 10^{-10} \text{m}^3/\text{C}$ for a bilayer YBCO (lattice constant along a and b axis : $a_a = a_b = 3.8 \times 10^{-10} \text{m}$ and that along c axis : $a_c = 5.8 \times 10^{-10} \text{m}$) and $1.0 \times 10^{-9} \text{m}^3/\text{C}$ for CeCoIn_5 ($a_a = a_b = 4.6 \times 10^{-10} \text{m}$ and $a_c = 7.6 \times 10^{-10} \text{m}$), respectively. In regard to the horizontal axis, unit of the temperature t_1 is 4000K for YBCO. On the other hand, we estimate the nearest neighbor hopping $t_1 = 400\text{K}$ for CeCoIn_5 , because the experimental data² shows that magnitude of R_H begins to increase below 40K, which corresponds to $0.1t_1$ in Fig. 10. The R_H without the CVC, which corresponds to the RTA, is almost constant. However, independently of the




FIG. 7: γ along the Fermi surface for $t_z = 0.4$, $\alpha_S = 0.995$ at $T = 0.02$, where the hot spots and the “cold lines” are depicted by circles and dotted thick line, respectively. The trajectories of k_{\parallel} are depicted on the Fermi surface in $k_z = 0, \pi$ as examples.

dimensionality, R_H with the CVC increases as temperature decreases, which is consistent with experimental results for high- T_c cuprate³⁶ and heavy fermion compounds (CeCoIn₅², CeCu_{6-x}Au_x⁴ and YbRh₂Si₂⁵). Namely, the RTA cannot explain the strong temperature dependence of the Hall coefficient close to the AF QCP. Moreover, in 3D case hot spots take point-like shape, which means that the effective electron density for transport phenomena (n_{eff}) is large compared with two-dimensional case. Since $R_H^{\text{RTA}} \approx \frac{1}{en_{\text{eff}}}$ is satisfied in the RTA, R_H^{eff} cannot become large in 3D systems.

As a result, the CVC is indispensable to explain the behavior of R_H in 3D close to the AF QCP. In the present results, the maximum enhancement of R_H is given by $R_H(T = 0.02)/R_H(t = 0.2) \sim 5$ for $t_z = 0.8$ and $\alpha_S = 0.998$. R_H should increase further if we calculate at lower temperatures. The shape of the Fermi surface in CeCoIn₅ resembles to that of our model for $t_z = 0.8$. However, to reproduce the experimental results in CeCoIn₅ quantitatively, we have to study it based on the realistic band structures of CeCoIn₅.^{38,39} Our calculation shows that R_H is strongly enhanced by the CVC even in 3D systems, and its maximum value becomes as large as that in 2D.

Here, we discuss the reason why R_H is strongly en-




FIG. 8: γ along the Fermi surface for $t_z = 0.8$, $\alpha_S = 0.995$, at $T = 0.02$ where the hot spots and the “cold lines” are depicted by circles and dotted thick line, respectively.




FIG. 9: The resistivity ρ with the CVC (solid line) and without the CVC (dotted line) for $t_z = 0, 0.4, 0.8$ as a function of T with $\alpha_S = 0.995$ at $T = 0.02$.

hanced by the CVC in 3D systems based on the numerical study. The general expression for σ_{xy} is given by^{30,40}

$$\sigma_{xy}/B = -\frac{e^3}{8\pi} \int dk_z \oint_{\text{FS}} dk_{\parallel} |\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{k}_{\perp}}|^2 \left(\frac{\partial \theta_{\mathbf{J}}(\mathbf{k})}{\partial k_{\parallel}} \right) \frac{1}{(\gamma_{\mathbf{k}})^2}, \quad (32)$$

where k_{\parallel} is the component of \mathbf{k} along the unit vector

$\mathbf{e}_{\parallel}(\mathbf{k}) = (\mathbf{e}_z \times \mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}})/|\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}|$ which is in the $k_x k_y$ -plane and parallel to the Fermi surface. $|\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{k}}|_{\perp} = \sqrt{J_{k_x}^2 + J_{k_y}^2}$, and $\theta_{\mathbf{J}}$ is the angle between the total current \mathbf{J} and the x axis. In this line integration \mathbf{k} -point moves anticlockwise along the Fermi surface around the k_z axis.

We see that for $t_z = 0.8$, cold spots (where $\gamma_{\mathbf{k}}$ is small) form lines (cold lines) at the center of the Fermi surface along the z axis in Fig. 8. As shown in the last term of eq. (32), main contribution for σ_{xy} is expected to come from the cold lines. We see that in Fig. 11 the momentum dependence of the absolute value of the total current $|\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{k}}|$ is quite similar to that of $\gamma_{\mathbf{k}}$.

In Fig. 12, we plot $\theta_{\mathbf{J}}$ along the trajectories of k_{\parallel} . As references, we also plot the corresponding quantity without the CVC, $\theta_{\mathbf{v}}$ for $k_z = 0-\pi/2$ and $k_z = 3\pi/4-\pi$ as a thin line and a dotted thin line, respectively. As show in Fig. 12, $\theta_{\mathbf{v}}$ for $k_z = 0-\pi/2$ and $k_z = 3\pi/4-\pi$ decrease and increase, respectively, along the trajectories of k_{\parallel} . On the other hand, $\theta_{\mathbf{J}}$ has a non-monotonic change along these trajectories. Especially, for $k_z = 3\pi/4-\pi$ $\theta_{\mathbf{J}}$ decreases contrary to the case of $\theta_{\mathbf{v}}$. We stress that the magnitude of $\partial\theta_{\mathbf{J}}/\partial k_{\parallel}$ becomes larger than that without the CVC ($\partial\theta_{\mathbf{v}}/\partial k_{\parallel}$) around the cold lines.

In Fig. 13, we plot the momentum resolved Hall conductivity $\sigma_{xy}(\mathbf{k})$ defined by $\sigma_{xy} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \sigma_{xy}(\mathbf{k})$, where $\sigma_{xy}(\mathbf{k})$ is given by $\sigma_{xy}(\mathbf{k}) = -\int \frac{d\epsilon}{2\pi N} \left(-\frac{\partial f}{\partial \epsilon}\right) |\text{Im}G_{\mathbf{k}}^R(\epsilon)| |G_{\mathbf{k}}^R(\epsilon)|^2 A_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon)$. The magnitude of $\sigma_{xy}(\mathbf{k})$ takes large values around the cold lines, especially for $k_z = -\pi/2-\pi/2$. We should comment that for $k_z = 3\pi/4, \pi$ the difference of the value of $\theta_{\mathbf{v}}$ and $\theta_{\mathbf{J}}$ becomes π at the edge of the trajectory as shown in Fig. 12 due to the CVC. At that time, the direction of $\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{k}}$ is opposite to that of $\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}$. In this case, strong AF spin fluctuation enhances the magnitude of $\mathcal{T}_{22}^1(\mathbf{k}\epsilon, \mathbf{k}'\epsilon')$ in the eq. (15) for $\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}' = \pm(\pi, \pi, \pi)$, $\pm(-\pi, \pi, \pi)$, $\pm(\pi, -\pi, \pi)$ and $\pm(\pi, \pi, -\pi)$. In this case, from eq. (15), we can obtain $\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{k}} \approx \mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}} + \alpha_{\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{k}'}$ ($0 < \alpha \leq 1$)¹⁹. This equation is easily solved as

$$\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{k}} = \frac{\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}} + \alpha_{\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}'}}{1 - \alpha_{\mathbf{k}} \alpha_{\mathbf{k}'}}. \quad (33)$$

In Fig. 14, we illustrate schematic behaviors of the quasi-particle velocity $\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}$ and the total current $\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{k}}$ on the Fermi surfaces sliced at $k_z = \pi$ (solid circle) and at $k_z = 0$ (dotted circle). We focus on the position of points A and B, which are connected by the nesting vector $\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}' = (-\pi, -\pi, \pi)$. Here, we write the quasi-particle velocities at A and B as $\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}$ and $\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}'}$, respectively. We see that $\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}$ and $\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}'}$ are antiparallel and $|\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}| < |\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}'}|$. Considering that $\alpha \lesssim 1$, $\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{k}}$ given in eq. (33) takes an opposite direction of $\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}$. In the same way, the total current and the quasi-particle velocity at C are also antiparallel. This nontrivial behavior of $\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{k}}$ has not been pointed out in previous studies for two-dimensional systems. This feature might induce an anomalous transport phenomenon.

In Fig. 15, we show the temperature dependence of R_H for $\alpha_S = 0.998$ (solid line) and $\alpha_S = 0.995$ (dotted line) for $t_z = 0.4$ and 0.8 . We see that R_H with the CVC increases as α_S approaches unity. It seems that R_H tends to diverge as the system approaches the AF QCP. The reason can be understood by seeing Fig. 16, where $\partial\theta_{\mathbf{J}}/\partial k_{\parallel}$ takes a large value at the cold spot which corresponds to the center of the k_{\parallel} axis. According to eq. (32), this fact leads to the strong enhancement of σ_{xy} .




FIG. 10: The Hall coefficient R_H with the CVC (solid line) and without the CVC (dotted line) for $t_z = 0, 0.4, 0.8$ as a function of T , with $\alpha_S = 0.995$ at $T = 0.02$.




FIG. 11: Absolute value of the total current \mathbf{J} with the CVC along the Fermi surface for $t_z = 0.8$ and $t_z = 0$ (thin line) with $\alpha_S = 0.995$ at $T = 0.02$.

Finally, we discuss the Nernst coefficient ν . It is known that ν vanishes in a complete spherical system, which is called Sondheimer cancellation.^{12,41} Although this cancellation is not perfect in real anisotropic systems, the magnitude of ν becomes small ($\sim \ln V/KT$) in conventional metals.

However, ν is enhanced below T^* (in the pseudo-gap region) for high- T_c cuprates. The authors of Refs. 41, 42 suggest a possibility that the vortex-like excitation




FIG. 12: the angle $\theta_{\mathbf{J}}$ of the total current \mathbf{J} with the CVC along the Fermi surface for $t_z = 0.8$, $\alpha_S = 0.995$ at $T = 0.02$. Thin line and dotted thin line approximately correspond to the angle $\theta_{\mathbf{v}}$ of the current without the CVC for $k_z = 0$ - $\pi/2$ and $k_z = 3\pi/4$ - π , respectively




FIG. 13: $\sigma_{xy}(\mathbf{k})$ along the Fermi surface for $t_z = 0.8$, $\alpha_S = 0.995$ at $T = 0.02$.

emerges in under-doped high- T_c cuprates to explain the enhancement of ν in the pseudo-gap region.

On the other hand, one of the present author^{21,43} has shown that strong enhancement of ν for high- T_c cuprates is naturally derived based on the FLEX+T-matrix approximation with the CVC. Furthermore, CeCoIn₅ also shows huge *negative* ν below 20K,³ which cannot be ascribed to the vortex mechanism. Here, we aim to reveal the mechanism of the unconventional enhancement for ν close to the QCP irrespective of the dimensionality.

We estimate the renormalization factor (z) dependence of the transport coefficients, before showing the result of ν . In the following, we will show that ρ and R_H are independent of z , and $\nu \propto z^{-1}$ in Hubbard model. Using the relation³²

$$\sum_{\mathbf{k}} = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int dS_{\mathbf{k}} dk_{\perp} = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int \frac{dS_{\mathbf{k}} d\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^0}{|\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}^0|} = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int \frac{dS_{\mathbf{k}} d\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^*}{z|\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}|}, \quad (34)$$




FIG. 14: Schematic illustration to show that at A and B $\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{k}}$ can direct opposite to $\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}$, where the Fermi surface for $k_z = 0, \pi$ are depicted by dotted and solid circle, respectively, and $\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{k}}$ and $\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}$ are by solid and dotted arrows, and the thick left-right arrows represent the coupling points.




FIG. 15: The Hall coefficient R_H with the CVC (upside) and without the CVC (downside) for $t_z = 0.4, 0.8$ as a function of T with $\alpha_S = 0.995$ (solid line), 0.998 (dotted line) at $T = 0.02$.

where $S_{\mathbf{k}}$ is the Fermi surface and k_{\perp} represents the momentum perpendicular to the Fermi surface and also using the relation $|G_{\mathbf{k}}^R(\epsilon)|^2 \sim \pi z \delta(\epsilon - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^*) / \gamma_{\mathbf{k}}$ ($\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^* = z(\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^0 + \text{Re}\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}}(0) - \mu)$) for $\gamma \ll T$, we obtain

$$\sigma_{xx} \sim \frac{e^2}{(2\pi)^3} \int \frac{dS_{\mathbf{k}} d\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^*}{z|\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}|} \left(-\frac{\partial f}{\partial \epsilon} \right)_{\epsilon=\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^*} \mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}x} \mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{k}x} \frac{z}{\gamma_{\mathbf{k}}} \quad (35)$$

$$\propto (z)^0. \quad (36)$$

In the same way, σ_{xy} is given by,

$$\sigma_{xy} \sim \frac{e^3 B}{4(2\pi)^3} \int \frac{dS_{\mathbf{k}} d\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^*}{z|\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}|} \left(-\frac{\partial f}{\partial \epsilon} \right)_{\epsilon=\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^*} A_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{z}{\gamma_{\mathbf{k}}^2} \quad (37)$$

$$\propto (z)^0. \quad (38)$$




FIG. 16: the angle $\theta_{\mathbf{J}}$ of the total current \mathbf{J} with the CVC along the Fermi surface for $t_z = 0.8$, $k_z = \pi/4$, $\alpha_S = 0.995$ (solid line) and $\alpha_S = 0.998$ (dotted line) at $T = 0.02$. Thin line approximately corresponds to one without the CVC.

We see that σ_{xx} and σ_{xy} are independent of z . Thus, we confirm that $\rho = 1/\sigma_{xx} \propto (z)^0$ and $R_H = \frac{\sigma_{xy}}{B\sigma_{xx}} \propto (z)^0$ are independent of z . On the other hand, thermopower S is given by

$$S \sim \frac{e}{(2\pi)^3 T \sigma_{xx}} \int \frac{dS_{\mathbf{k}} d\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^*}{z|\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}|} \left(-\frac{\partial f}{\partial \epsilon} \right)_{\epsilon=\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^*} \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^* \mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}x} \mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{k}x} \frac{z}{\gamma_{\mathbf{k}}} \quad (39)$$

$$= \frac{e}{(2\pi)^3 T \sigma_{xx}} \int \frac{dS_{\mathbf{k}} d\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^*}{z|\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}|} \left(-\frac{\partial f}{\partial \epsilon} \right)_{\epsilon=\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^*} (\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^*)^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial k_{\perp}} \left(\frac{\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}x} \mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{k}x}}{|\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}| \gamma_{\mathbf{k}}} \right)_{\epsilon=0} \quad (40)$$

$$= \frac{e\pi^2 k_B^2 T}{3(2\pi)^3 \sigma_{xx}} \int \frac{dS_{\mathbf{k}}}{z|\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}|} \frac{\partial}{\partial k_{\perp}} \left(\frac{\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}x} \mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{k}x}}{|\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}| \gamma_{\mathbf{k}}} \right)_{\epsilon=0} \quad (41)$$

$$\propto z^{-1}, \quad (42)$$

and using $Q_{\mathbf{k}} \sim \mathbf{q}_{\mathbf{k}} = \epsilon \mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}$ for $T \rightarrow 0$, $\alpha_{xy} = L_{xy}^{21} (+i\delta)/T^2$ is given by

$$\alpha_{xy} \sim \frac{Be^2}{2(2\pi)^3 T} \int \frac{dS_{\mathbf{k}} d\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^*}{z|\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}|} \left(-\frac{\partial f}{\partial \epsilon} \right)_{\epsilon=\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^*} \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^* A''_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^*) \frac{z}{\gamma_{\mathbf{k}}} \quad (43)$$

$$= \frac{Be^2}{2(2\pi)^3 T} \int \frac{dS_{\mathbf{k}} d\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^*}{z|\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}|} \left(-\frac{\partial f}{\partial \epsilon} \right)_{\epsilon=\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^*} (\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^*)^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial k_{\perp}} \left(\frac{A''_{\mathbf{k}}}{|\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}| \gamma_{\mathbf{k}}^2} \right)_{\epsilon=0} \quad (44)$$

$$= \frac{Be^2 \pi^2 k_B^2 T}{6(2\pi)^3} \int \frac{dS_{\mathbf{k}}}{z|\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}|} \frac{\partial}{\partial k_{\perp}} \left(\frac{A''_{\mathbf{k}}}{|\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}| \gamma_{\mathbf{k}}^2} \right)_{\epsilon=0} \quad (45)$$

$$\propto z^{-1}, \quad (46)$$

where $A''_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon)$ is defined by

$$A''_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon) = \gamma_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon) \left\{ \mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon) \times [\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon) \times \nabla]_z \left[\frac{\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon)}{\gamma_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon)} \right] \right\}_z \quad (47)$$

Thus, we obtain $\nu = \frac{\alpha_{xy}}{B\sigma_{xx}} - \frac{S\sigma_{xy}}{B\sigma_{xx}} \propto z^{-1}$. We must consider z in detail to calculate ν , because z is much smaller in heavy fermion systems. From the experiment of the de Haas-van Alphen⁴⁴, we can estimate that the effective mass $m^* \sim 100m_0$ (m_0 is the bare electron mass)

and the mass obtained by the band calculation $m_b \sim 2m_0$ in branches β . Then, the mass enhancement factor z^{-1} is given by $z^{-1} = m^*/m_b \sim 50$.

Although the FLEX can describe various critical phenomena near the AF QCP, the mass enhancement is not completely explained with the FLEX in heavy fermion systems. The reason is that local correlations are not fully taken into account in the framework of the FLEX, because the vertex corrections in the self-energy are not included. According to Ref. 45, we separate the self-energy into the ‘‘local part’’ and the ‘‘non-local part’’. In this case, total renormalization factor z is obtained as $z = z_0 z^*$, where z_0 is the local renormalization factor which cannot be included in the FLEX and renormalization factor $z^* = (1 - (\partial\Sigma/\partial\omega))^{-1}$ is obtained by the FLEX. To fit the total renormalization factor to the experimental results ($z^{-1} = 50$), we use $z_0 = 3/50$, because $z^* \sim 1/3$ in our calculation.

We show the obtained temperature dependence of the Nernst coefficient ν in Fig. 17, where solid and dotted lines correspond to ν with and without the CVC, respectively, for $t_z = 0$, $t_z = 0.4$ and $t_z = 0.8$. In this figure, we chose the parameters for heavy fermion CeCoIn₅, i.e., $a_a = a_b = 4.6 \times 10^{-10}$ m, and then, $\frac{k_B a_a a_b}{\hbar} \sim 28$ nV/KT has been multiplied as a unit of calculated value, and the local mass enhancement factor z_0^{-1} has been also multiplied.

We see that ν without the CVC is almost constant, and ν with the CVC shows enormous increase at low temperatures, especially in strong three-dimensional case ($t_z = 0.8$) where the Fermi surface is similar to that of CeCoIn₅. Then, the temperature dependence of ν resembles to that of R_H . This temperature dependence of $|\nu|$ is consistent with the giant Nernst effect in CeCoIn₅ ($|\nu| \sim 1 \mu\text{V}/\text{KT}$ for $T = 5\text{K}$).³ Here, we discuss the reason why the magnitude of ν becomes large. $A_{\mathbf{k}}$ and $A'_{\mathbf{k}}$ given in eqs. (19) and (28) are rewritten as

$$A_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon) = |\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon)|_{\perp} \left(\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon) \times \frac{\partial}{\partial k_{\parallel}} \mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon) \right)_z \quad (48)$$

$$= |\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon)|_{\perp} |\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon)|_{\perp}^2 \frac{\partial \theta_{\mathbf{J}}(\mathbf{k})}{\partial k_{\parallel}}, \quad (49)$$

$$A'_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon) = \gamma_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon) |\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon)|_{\perp} \left(\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon) \times \frac{\partial}{\partial k_{\parallel}} \frac{\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon)}{\gamma_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon)} \right)_z \quad (50)$$

$$= |\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}(\epsilon)|_{\perp} \left[(Q_{k_x} J_{k_x} + Q_{k_y} J_{k_y}) \frac{\partial \theta_{\mathbf{J}}(\mathbf{k})}{\partial k_{\parallel}} + (\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{k}} \times \mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{k}})_z \frac{\partial}{\partial k_{\parallel}} \log \left(\frac{|\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{k}}|_{\perp}}{\gamma_{\mathbf{k}}} \right) \right]. \quad (51)$$

Here, $\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{k}}$ is the total heat current with the CVC. We stress that $\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{k}} \sim \epsilon \mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}}$ and $\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{k}}$ is not parallel to $\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{k}}$ when the AF fluctuations are strong.²¹ In this case, ν is strongly enhanced due to the second term of $A'_{\mathbf{k}}$ in high- T_c cuprates.⁴³ We expect that the same mechanism will give the enhancement of ν in the present study for three-dimensional case. In NCCO, ν is enhanced by the CVC due to the AF fluctuation below 300K, whereas

the increment of ν for LSCO is brought by the CVC due to both AF and superconducting fluctuations below $T^* \sim 150\text{K}$.²¹ Because of the relation $\nu \propto \gamma^{-1}$, ν is proportional to ρ^{-1} for a fixed α_S . This fact would contribute to the enhancement of ν in 3D case, as shown in Figs. 17, 18. We show the temperature dependence of ν for both $\alpha_S = 0.995$ and 0.998 in Fig. 18. ν with the CVC increases as α_S approaches unity, which resembles to the behavior of R_H . Consequently, the magnitude of ν increases almost divergently in the vicinity of the AF QCP.




FIG. 17: The Nernst coefficient ν with the CVC (solid line) and without the CVC (dotted line) for $t_z = 0, 0.4, 0.8$ as a function of T with $\alpha_S = 0.995$ at $T = 5\text{K}$




FIG. 18: The Nernst coefficient ν with the CVC (upside) and without the CVC (downside) for $t_z = 0.4, 0.8$ as a function of T with $\alpha_S = 0.995$ (solid line) and 0.998 (dotted line) at $T = 5\text{K}$.

IV. CONCLUSION

We have calculated microscopically the resistivity ρ , the Hall coefficient R_H and Nernst coefficient ν for three-dimensional Hubbard model close to the AF QCP based on the Fermi-liquid theory. This is a first microscopic calculation for the Hall coefficient and the Nernst coefficient with the current vertex corrections (CVC) in the three-dimensional system. In two-dimensional systems, it is established that the CVC plays an important role when the AF fluctuations are strong. On the other hand, the CVC vanishes completely in infinite dimension $d = \infty$. Thus, it is a very important theoretical issue to clarify whether the CVC is significant or not in three-dimensional systems. We find that the CVC influences crucially on various transport phenomena in both two and three-dimensional systems close to the AF QCP.

We have shown that the magnitude of R_H and ν is strongly enhanced with the decrease of temperature due to the CVC. These strong temperature dependences in the Hall coefficient and the Nernst coefficient come from the difference between the direction of the total current (\mathbf{J}_k) and that of \mathbf{v}_k around the cold spots. The difference of directions increases as the temperature decreases near the QCP, which can be expressed in terms of the effective curvature $\partial\theta_{\mathbf{J}}/\partial k_{\parallel}$ of Fermi surface obtained by the direction of \mathbf{J}_k . The obtained values of R_H at the lowest temperature ($T = 0.02$) is more than 5 times larger than those at high temperatures for three-dimensional system ($t_z = 0.8$). This result is qualitatively consistent with experimental results in various three-dimensional heavy fermion systems close to the AF QCP, such as CeCoIn_5 and $\text{CeCu}_{6-x}\text{Au}_x$. This strong enhancement cannot be explained by the relaxation time approximation (RTA).

In the present paper, we also studied the momentum dependence of relaxation time in three-dimensional systems due to strong AF spin fluctuations. In two-dimensional systems, it is known that hot spots and cold spots take line structures along z axis, as the systems approach to the AF QCP. In three-dimensional systems, we find that hot spots become point-like (“hot points”) while the cold spots remain to take line structures (“cold lines”). The emergence of hot points and cold lines is expected to be general in three-dimensional systems close to the AF QCP. Transport phenomena are mainly determined by the cold spots. The area of cold spots in the phase space plays an important role. We find that the CVC around cold spots produces strong enhancement of R_H and ν . We emphasize that the strong enhancement of R_H and ν comes from the effective curvature of the Fermi surface, $\partial\theta_{\mathbf{j}}/\partial k_{\parallel}$, enhanced by the CVC on cold lines, as shown in Fig. 12. Note that obtained results for R_H and ν without the CVC, which corresponds to the RTA, are almost temperature independent.

In future, we will perform a quantitative study for the transport phenomena in CeCoIn_5 and CeRhIn_5 , using a realistic band structure predicted by band calculations.^{38,39} In the present paper, signs of R_H and

ν are opposite to actual experimental results. We expect that this discrepancy can be resolved by taking into account a proper band structure.

V. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by a Grant-in-Aid for 21st Century COE “Frontiers of Computational Science”. Nu-

merical calculations were performed at the supercomputer center, ISSP. The authors are grateful to K. Yamada, J. Inoue, N. Nagaosa, Y. Matsuda, Y. Suzumura, D. Hirashima, Y. Nakajima and K. Tanaka for useful comments and discussions.

-
- ¹ C. Petrovic, P. G. Pagliuso, M. F. Hundley, R. Movshovich, J. L. Sarrao, J. D. Thompson, Z. Fisk and P. Monthoux, *J. Phys. Condens.: Matter* **13**, L337 (2001).
- ² Y. Nakajima, K. Izawa, Y. Matsuda, S. Uji, T. Terashima, H. Shishido, R. Settai, Y. Onuki and H. Kontani, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **73**, 5 (2004).
- ³ R. Bel, K. Behnia, Y. Nakajima, K. Izawa, Y. Matsuda, H. Shishido, R. Settai and Y. Onuki, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 217002 (2004).
- ⁴ T. Fukuhara, H. Takashima, K. Maezawa and Y. Onuki, unpublished.
- ⁵ S. Paschen, T. Lühmann, S. Wirth, P. Gegenwart, O. Trovarelli, C. Geibel, F. Steglich, P. Coleman and Q. Si, *Nature* **432**, 881 (2004).
- ⁶ B. P. Stojković and D. Pines, *Phys. Rev. B* **55**, 8576 (1997).
- ⁷ A. Rosch, *Phys. Rev. B* **62**, 4945 (2000).
- ⁸ R. Hlubina and T. M. Rice, *Phys. Rev. B* **51**, 9253 (1995).
- ⁹ J. M. Harris, Y. F. Yan, P. Matl, N. P. Ong, P. W. Anderson, T. Kimura and K. Kitazawa, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 1391 (1995).
- ¹⁰ Y. Ando and T. Murayama, *Phys. Rev. B* **60**, R6991 (1999).
- ¹¹ H. Kontani, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **70**, 1873 (2001).
- ¹² E. H. Sondheimer, *Proc. R. Soc. London, Ser. A* **193**, 484 (1948).
- ¹³ T. Moriya, Y. Takahashi and K. Ueda, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **59**, 2905 (1990).
- ¹⁴ K. Ueda, T. Moriya and Y. Takahashi, *J. Phys. Chem. Solids* **53**, 1515 (1992).
- ¹⁵ T. Moriya and K. Ueda, *Adv. Phys.* **49**, 555 (2000); *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **66**, 1299 (2003).
- ¹⁶ N. E. Bickers, D. J. Scalapino, and S. R. White, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **62**, 961 (1989).
- ¹⁷ N. E. Bickers and D. J. Scalapino, *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **193**, 206 (1989).
- ¹⁸ P. Monthoux and G. G. Lonzarich, *Phys. Rev. B* **59**, 14598 (1999).
- ¹⁹ H. Kontani, K. Kanki and K. Ueda, *Phys. Rev. B* **59**, 14723 (1999).
- ²⁰ H. Kontani, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **70**, 2840 (2001).
- ²¹ H. Kontani, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 237003 (2002).
- ²² H. Kontani and H. Kino, *Phys. Rev. B* **63**, 134524 (2001).
- ²³ A. Georges, G. Kotliar, W. Krauth and M. J. Rozenberg, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **68**, 13 (1996).
- ²⁴ G. Kotliar and D. Vollhardt, *Phys. Today* **57**, 53 (2004).
- ²⁵ S. Koikegami, S. Fujimoto, and K. Yamada, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **66**, 1438 (1997).
- ²⁶ H. Kontani and K. Ueda, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 5619 (1998).
- ²⁷ G. Baym and L. P. Kadanoff, *Phys. Rev.* **124**, 287 (1961).
- ²⁸ G. Baym, *Phys. Rev.* **127**, 1391 (1962).
- ²⁹ G. M. Eliashberg, *Zh. Éksp. Teor. Fiz.* **41**, 410 (1961) [*Sov. Phys. JETP* **14**, 886 (1962)].
- ³⁰ H. Kohno and K. Yamada, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **80**, 623 (1988).
- ³¹ G. D. Mahan, *Many-Particle Physics*, 2nd ed. (Plenum Press, New York, 1990).
- ³² H. Kontani, *Phys. Rev. B* **67**, 014408 (2003).
- ³³ N. D. Mermin and H. Wagner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **17**, 1133 (1966).
- ³⁴ T. Ebihara, N. Harrison, M. Jaime, S. Uji and J. C. Lashley, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 246401 (2004).
- ³⁵ T. Moriya and T. Takimoto, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **64**, 960 (1995).
- ³⁶ J. Takeda, T. Nishikawa and M. Sato, *Physica C* **231**, 293 (1994).
- ³⁷ Y. Ōnuki, R. Settai, K. Sugiyama, T. Takeuchi, T. C. Kobayashi, Y. Haga and E. Yamamoto, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **73**, 769 (2004).
- ³⁸ T. Maehira, T. Hotta, K. Ueda and A. Hasegawa, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **72**, 854 (2003).
- ³⁹ Y. Haga, Y. Inada, H. Harima, K. Oikawa, M. Murakawa, H. Nakawaki, Y. Tokiwa, D. Aoki, H. Shishido, S. Ikeda, N. Watanabe and Y. Onuki, *Phys. Rev. B* **63**, 060503(R) (2001).
- ⁴⁰ H. Fukuyama, H. Ebisawa and Y. Wada, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **42**, 494 (1969).
- ⁴¹ Y. Wang, Z. A. Xu, T. Kakeshita, S. Uchida, S. Ono, Y. Ando and N. P. Ong, *Phys. Rev. B* **64**, 224519 (2001).
- ⁴² Z. A. Xu, N. P. Ong, Y. Wang, T. Kakeshita and S. Uchida, *Nature (London)* **406**, 486 (2000).
- ⁴³ H. Kontani and K. Yamada, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **74**, 155 (2005).
- ⁴⁴ R. Settai, H. Shishido, S. Ikeda, Y. Murakawa, M. Nakashima, D. Aoki, Y. Haga, H. Harima and Y. Ōnuki, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **13**, L627 (2001).
- ⁴⁵ Y. Nishikawa, H. Ikeda and K. Yamada, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **71**, 1140 (2002).