arXiv:cond-mat/0610744v1 [cond-mat.dis-nn] 26 Oct 2006

Anderson transition: numerical vs analytical results (comment on the review article by P.Markos cond-mat/0609580)

I. M. Suslov
P.L.Kapitza Institute for Physical Problems,
119337 Moscow, Russia

In the recent review article, P.Markos admits that practically all numerical results on the critical behavior near the Anderson transition are in conflict with analytical expectations, but no serious discussion of this fact is given. The aim of the present comment is to give an analysis of the arising situation.

The recent paper by P.Markos [1] provides the extensive review on numerical investigations of Anderson localization. Such detailed review is quite valuable and long expected. Its value is slightly diminished by the fact that the author is too anxious to present his own results, even in the cases when the results of other authors are more advanced. No preference is given to the papers where record system sizes are achieved [2, 3, 4, 5]; no attention is given to results, which contradict to a conventional paradigm [6, 7]; not all characteristics of the wave functions studied in the literature [8] are discussed.

It is admitted in Sec. 13.3 of [1] that practically all numerical results on the critical behavior near the Anderson transition are in contradiction with the analytical predictions, but no serious discussion of this circumstance is given. In fact, a situation with numerical algorithms is rather serious, and the aim of the present comment is to analyse this situation.

Fig. 62 in [1] presents the dependence of the critical exponent ν of the correlation length on the space dimensionality d and its comparison with predictions of the self-consistent theory by Vollhardt and Wölfle [9] (see also papers [10]). Such comparison is rather instructive since the results of [9] summarize in the compact form all theoretical expectations. Nevertheless, the original version of the theory [9] is rather crude [1] and contradiction with it does not provide a serious argument against the numerical methods. However, there are two fundamental contradictions that should be discussed.

[1] The evident drawbacks of the self-consistent theory [9] are the crude method of solving the Bethe–Salpeter equation, violation of the Ward identity and neglection of the possible spatial dispersion of the diffusion coefficient. These drawbacks were removed in the symmetry approach of the paper [11]: if only evident symmetry of the system is taken into account and situation of the general position (compatible with this symmetry) is considered, then the results of [9] are reproduced. The arguments on the absense of the hidden symmetry can be also given [11], but these arguments cannot be considered as indisputable.

(A) Numerical results are in conflict with the analytical prediction $\nu = 1/\epsilon$ at $\epsilon \to 0$, obtained for a space dimensionality $d = 2 + \epsilon$ [12]. The reference on the specific result by Hikami given in [1] (see Eqs. 193, 194) is disputable: the theory for $d = 2 + \epsilon$ surely needs some modification due to instability of the renormalization group caused by the high-gradient catastrophe [13]. However, the result $\nu = 1/\epsilon$ for $\epsilon \to 0$ is valid for an arbitrary β-function of the form

$$\beta(g) = \epsilon + \frac{A_1}{g} + \frac{A_2}{g^2} + \frac{A_3}{g^3} + \dots \tag{1}$$

with $A_1 < 0$ (g is the Thouless conductance), i.e. in any variant of the theory compatible with general philosophy of one-parameter scaling [14] [2] Contradiction with the result $\nu = 1/\epsilon$ is possible, only if the one-parameter scaling hypothesis is rejected; but then the treatment of the raw numerical data becomes self-contradictory, being entirely based on this hypothesis.

(B) The dependence of ν on d (Fig. 62 in [1]) looks perfectly smooth in the interval $2 < d \leq 5$: such behavior is in direct contradiction with the Bogolyubov theorem on renormalizability of the φ^4 field theory [16], which is mathematically equivalent to the problem of an electron in the Gaussian random field [17, 18, 19, 20]. The φ^4 theory is renormalizable for $d \leq 4$ and nonrenormalizable for $d > 4$, so $d = 4$ is a singular point on the d-axis. It is expected (though it is not a theorem) that $d = 4$ is an upper critical dimension [3], where d-dependence of the critical exponents has a cusp, while for $d > 4$ they are independent on d and equil to their mean field values ($\nu = 1/2$ in the present case). Nothing of the kind is observed numerically. Furthermore, nonrenormalizability for $d > 4$ makes existence of scale invariance *absolutely impossible* (due to impossibility to exclude microscopic length scales from any quantity). In spite of this, the numerical algorithms seems to have no difficulties in interpretation of results in terms of one-parameter scaling, and it demonstrates their quality. In fact, one can derive from the Vollhardt and Wölfle theory [9] or from two-parameter scaling [22] that the Thouless conductance is not stationary in the critical point for dimensions $d \geq 4$; so the conventional condition for a critical point (see Fig. 61 in [1]) becomes invalid (see discussion in [23][Sec. 4.2]).

New problems in numerical algorithms were discovered recently in studies of the second moments for a solution of the Cauchy problem for the Schrödinger equation in quasi-1D systems [23, 24, 25]. Roughly half of numerical papers use finite-size scaling for the minimal Lyapunov exponent γ_{min} [1][Sec. 12.1], related with the growth of the typical value of the Cauchy solution. Analytical calculation of γ_{min} is possible only under rather restrictive assumptions [26, 27]. On the other hand, a complete analytical investigation is possible for

[2] The negative sign of A_1 is a basis of the weak localization theory [15] and has numerous experimental confirmations.

[3] A situation with the upper critical dimension is perfectly clear for the problem of density of states. Simplification of theory for $d > 4$ was demonstrated and $(4 - \epsilon)$-dimensional theory was developed in the series of papers [21] (see also review [20]).

the minimal exponent β_{min}, characterizing a growth of the second moments [25]. Inequality $\beta_{min} \geq 2\gamma_{min}$ can be rigorously established, while the order of magnitude relation $\beta_{min} \sim \gamma_{min}$ is expected in the typical physical situation; the latter relation is valid for weak [26] and strong [27] disorder and confirmed by extensive numerical studies [28]. From viewpoint of general scaling philosophy the use of β_{min} or γ_{min} is practically equivalent. The following becomes clear as a result of such studies.

(C) In $2D$ systems, a conventional finite-size scaling approach based on β_{min} leads to unumbiguous conclusion on existence of the Kosterlitz-Thouless type transition between exponential and power law localization, and absense of one parameter scaling for β_{min} [25]. Inequality $\beta_{min} \geq 2\gamma_{min}$ makes it possible to establish validity of both conclusions also for finite-size scaling based on γ_{min}. There exists the possibility to restore one-parameter scaling, but it requires essential modification of the conventional algorithm: one should use some effective exponent γ_{eff} instead γ_{min}. After such modification, the $2D$ phase transition is predicted not for all systems.

These considerations are confirmed by Fig. 37 in [1], where absense of scaling for $\langle g \rangle$ is clearly visible: different dependences cannot be reduced to a single curve by a scale transformation. The analogous behavior can be surely found for other quantities, but the data for weak disorder ($W < 4$) are practically never presented in numerical papers.

(D) For $d > 2$, a finite-size scaling based on β_{min} leads to the values of critical disorder, essentially different from those obtained in numerical experiments [23]. [4] Two different interpretations of this fact are possible:

(a) Contemporary numerical experiments give incorrect results for the critical point. It is related with the principal inapplicability of one-parameter scaling for $d \geq 4$, while for $d = 3$ a large length scale L_0 exists, so that a true critical behavior can be found only for systems with $L \gtrsim L_0$ (see [23][Sec. 4.2] for details).

(b) If we accept validity of the conventional numerical results, then we should assume that the point of the Anderson transition is expanded into the band of the critical states [23]. Surprisingly, such possibility has direct numerical confirmations [6, 7]. [5] Realization of such possibility signifies that all existing analytical approaches are incorrect. In particulary, it means invalidity of the one-parameter scaling theory [14], and interpretation of practically all numerical experiments becomes internally inconsistent.

One can see, that (a) and (b) have approximately the same consequences for numerical algorithms. The given alternative is probably resolved in favour of (a) in the recent paper [29]. Indeed, all dependences in Fig. 2 of [29] are practically linear for $L < 30$ in accordance with the old results by Schreiber [7]; so the crossover between Fig. 5,a and Fig. 5,b of [23] occurs at $L \sim 30$, and a large length scale $L_0 \sim 30$ appears in the 3D Anderson model.

One more problem is related with the critical distribution of conductance.

[4] The results for critical disorder, obtained in [23, 25] and [24] by the essentially different methods, coincide for $d = 2$ and $d \geq 4$ (not for $d = 3$), but their interpretation is different.

[5] If they are not artifacts related with existence of the large scale L_0.

(E) Figs. 39, 40, 43, 44, 46, 52 in [1] show the distribution of conductance $p_c(g)$ in the critical point: it has a singularity at $g = 1$ and the rapid decrease for large g. Such behavior is quite understandable (see [1][Sec. 10]) for quasi-1D systems (with the size $L^{d-1} \times L_z$ and sufficiently large L_z), but its validity for the real d-dimensional systems ($L \sim L_z$) seems doubtful. The singularity at $g = 1$ looks incredible [6], and the decrease more quicker than exponent for large g contradicts both to the direct renormalization group analysis for high moments of g [30] and to the attempts of reconstruction of the whole distribution $p_c(g)$ [31]. The second defect may be attributed to not sufficiently large system size L, but it is claimed in [1] that the distribution is stationary and independent on L (as a result, validity of one-parameter scaling is declared for the whole distribution). Such thing is impossible, if we have any belief in analytical theory. It looks more likely, that formulas for multi-channel localization are used beyond the range of their applicability. It is not evident in the general case that the Landauer conductance measured in numerical experiments coincides with the Kubo conductance treated in analytical papers. Indeed, the method used for calculation of conductance fails outside the unperturbed band (see the end of Appendix A in [1]); it means that the role of evanescent channels is not reflected adequatly. Such channels always exist for $d > 2$ and give essential contribution for sufficiently small L_z.

Few minor remarks.

(F) It is repeatedly stated in [1] that one-parameter scaling is proved numerically for many quantities. However, one should be quite careful with empirical proofs of scaling: it is possible to suggest an algorithm, which makes it possible to "prove" scaling in practically any situation [25][Sec. 4]. The appearance of scaling curves presented in Figs. 53, 57 in [1] resembles very closely the expected result of applying such "algorithm".

(G) Existence of deviations from scaling is admitted by numerical researches (see Fig. 54 in [1]), but it is believed that they can be correctly analysed. As an example of such analysis, the paper [133] is cited in [1], whose results are qualified as the most accurate and reliable. In fact, the analysis of [133] arouse serious objections (see discussion in [32]). In our opinion, the correct interpretation of deviations from scaling is still an open question.

Overlooking the arguments (A–G), one can see the general tendency: the numerical algorithms have repeated problems with one-parameter scaling, on which they are founded. Does it mean a complete failure of the one-parameter scaling hypothesis? Such possibility can be discussed, but we prefer a less radical point of view: in principle, scaling exists but the numerical algorithms do not control a correct choice of scaling variables.

It looks as a joke, but since 1981 practically nobody studied the Anderson transition numerically as change in the character of wave functions. Contemporary numerical al-

[6] There are no phase transitions in finite systems according to the Lee and Yang theorem. Analogously, there is no ground for any other singularities in them. If $p_c(g)$ is independent of L, then it can be calculated for finite L.

gorithms are based on the idea that any dimensionless quantity A related to a system, spatially restricted on a scale L, is a function of a ratio L/ξ (ξ is the correlation length)

$$A = F\left(L/\xi\right) , \tag{2}$$

which makes it possible to investigate the dependence of ξ on parameters. Relation (2) is a consequence of scale invariance and is valid under condition that a quantity A has no essential dependence on microscopical length scales. The latter condition is difficult to control, since the quantities A used in numerical algorithms have rather indirect relation to the Anderson transition.

Let us discuss this point on the example of the ferromagnetic phase transition. It is well known, that scale invariance is the property of the spatial picture of fluctuations of the magnetic moment. As a result, the relation (2) is valid for the quantities that are directly determined by these fluctuations, i.e. for more or less all magnetic quantities. If we consider the properties, characterizing a ferromagnet as a normal metal and related with its electron or phonon spectra etc., then there is no ground for validity of (2). Difference between magnetic and nonmagnetic properties is intuitively evident, but the analogous subdivision becomes nontrivial for phase transitions of the different nature. One can suggest, that the numerical algorithms for the Anderson transition use "nonmagmetic" or not completely "magnetic" quantities. Constructive analysis of a situation with the Lyapunov exponents is given in [25][Sec. 5].

The author of [1] sees the origin of controversy in the fact that analytical theory deals with averaged quantities and does not treat adequately their statistical fluctuations. Such position is rather weak, as one can see looking at the arguments (A–G). Indeed, general scaling philosophy (argument A) does not specify the exact sense of the Thouless conductance g: it is some characteristic value, which should not be primitively identified with $\langle g \rangle$ [14]. Of course, most of analytical theories deal with average conductivity or density of states, but self-averaging of these quantities is rigorously proven [33]. On the other hand, one can consider the higher moments of these quantities and arrive once again to some variant (more complicated) of the φ^4 field theory with the same renormalizability properties (argument B). The quantity β_{min} (arguments C and D) is indeed related with averaged quantities (the second moments of the Cauchy solution) but its relation with the self-averaging quantity γ_{min} was discussed in details [25]. The argument E deals directly with the distribution of g. The arguments F and G are related with the quantities used in numerical algorithms.

Argumentation of [1], that there is no need to deal with large systems in order to obtain reliable results, is also weak. The statement on the stability of the results with the time (during which the system size L increases essentially) is based on the rather special choice of publications. In fact, the value of ν for $d = 3$ shows the essential systematic drift with the time: $\nu = 0.66$ [34], $\nu = 1.2 \pm 0.3$ [35], $\nu = 1.35 \pm 0.15$ [36], $\nu = 1.45 \pm 0.08$ [2], $\nu = 1.54 \pm 0.08$ [37], $\nu = 1.57 \pm 0.02$ [38]. On the other hand, Fig. 37 in [1] shows the

results for 2D systems of rather large size (till $L = 1000$), demonstrating the behavior, which "naively ... might be interpreted as a metal–insulator transition" at $W_c \approx 2$. The author of [1] does not accept such "naive" interpretation and believes that there is no metallic phase in the 2D case ($W_c = 0$). The question arises: why interpretation of the results for $d = 3$ with $L \leq 22$ (Fig. 53), $d = 4$ with $L \leq 10$ (Fig. 61, left), $d = 5$ with $L \leq 8$ (Fig. 61, right) should not be considered as naive?

We should admit, however, that there is one serious argument in favour of numerical algorithms: investigation of different quantities and different models leads to approximately the same results for the critical behavior [1]. When problems with scaling are essential, such universality looks incredible (though attempts of its explanation can be made [23][Sec. 4.2]). Under the close inspection, this universality is not so pronounced: one can see from the figure in [39] that overall scattering of results for the exponent ν in the 3D case, related with different methods and models, is rather large ($1.20 \div 1.75$), while the essentially higher accuracy is declared in the individual experiments (e.g. $\nu = 1.57 \pm 0.02$ in [38]). Recently, the essential counter-example to this universality was discovered: the use of the quantities $1/\beta_{min}L$ and $1/\gamma_{min}L$ in the capacity of A gives essentially different results [23], though β_{min} and γ_{min} are very close from the physical viewpoint. Probably, another examples of such kind can be found, and it may occur that the discussed universality has a pure psychological origin: the algorithms leading to the results, essentially different from conventional, are refused at the early stage of investigation. Historically, such situation took place with the minimal metallic conductivity, when a lot of experimentalists during twenty years measured one and the same "correct" value of it.

In conclusion, we have analysed controversy between the numerical and analytical results for the critical behavior near the Anderson transition. It looks, that the most probable reasons for such controversy are the following: (a) not sufficiently good choice of scaling variables; (b) principal inapplicability of one-parameter scaling for $d \geq 4$; (c) existence of a large length scale L_0 for $d = 3$; (d) the use of formulas for multi-channel localization beyond the range of their applicability. It is desirable to analyse critically, what conclusions can be made from the raw data without use of one-parameter scaling. The search of the quantities, whose scaling can be rigorously proven, becomes an urgent problem.

This work is partially supported by RFBR (grant 03-02-17519).

References

[1] P.Markos, cond-mat/0609580.

[2] I. Kh. Zharekeshev, B. Kramer, Phys. Rev. B **51**, 17239 (1995); Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 717 (1997).

[3] M. Schreiber, H. Grussbach, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 607 (1991).

[4] A. Mildenberger, F. Evers, A. D. Mirlin, Phys. Rev. B **66**, 033109 (2002).

[5] F. Milde, R. A. Romer, M. Schreiber, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 6028 (2000).

[6] J. T. Edwards, D. J. Thouless, J. Phys. C **5**, 807 (1972); B. J. Last, D. J. Thouless, J. Phys. C **7**, 699 (1974).

[7] M. Schreiber, J. Phys. C **18**, 2490 (1985); Physica A **167**, 188 (1990).

[8] G. Schubert, A. Weisse, G. Wellein, H. Feshke, cond-mat/0309015.

[9] D. Vollhardt, P. W*ö*lfle, Phys. Rev. B **22**, 4666 (1980); Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 699 (1982).

[10] A. Kawabata, Solid State Commun. **38**, 823 (1981).

B. Shapiro, Phys. Rev. B **25**, 4266 (1982).

A. V. Myasnikov, M. V. Sadovskii, Fiz. Tverd. Tela (Leningrad) **34**, 3569 (1982).

[11] I. M. Suslov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **108**, 1686 (1995) [JETP **81**, 925 (1995)]; cond-mat/0111407.

[12] F. Wegner, Z. Phys. B **35**, 207 (1979); L. Sch*ä*fer, F. Wegner, Z. Phys. B **38**, 113 (1980). S. Hikami, Phys. Rev. B **24**, 2671 (1981).

K. B. Efetov, A. I. Larkin, D. E. Khmelnitskii, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **79**, 1120 (1980) [Sov. Phys. JETP **52**, 568 (1980)].

K. B. Efetov, Adv. Phys. **32**, 53 (1983).

[13] V. E. Kravtsov, I. V. Lerner, V. I. Yudson, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **94**, 255 (1988) [Sov. Phys. JETP **67**, 1441 (1988)].

F. Wegner, Z. Phys. B **78**, 33 (1990).

[14] E. Abrahams, P. W. Anderson, D. C. Licciardello, and T. V. Ramakrishman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **42**, 673 (1979).

[15] B. L. Al'tshuler, A. G. Aronov, D. E. Khmel'nitskii, and A. I. Larkin in Quantum Theory of Solids, edited by I. M. Lifshitz, Mir Publishers, Moscow, 1982.

[16] N. N. Bogolyubov, D. V. Shirkov, Introduction to the Theory of Quantized Fields, New York: John Wiley, 1980.

[17] Ma S., Modern Theory of Critical Phenomena, Reading, Mass.: W.A.Benjamin, Advanced Book Program, 1976.

[18] A. Nitzan, K. F. Freed, M. N. Cohen, Phys. Rev. B **15**, 4476 (1977).

[19] M. V. Sadovskii, Usp. Fiz. Nauk **133**, 223 (1981) [Sov. Phys. Usp. **24**, 96 (1981)].

[20] I. M. Suslov, Usp. Fiz. Nauk **168**, 503 (1998) [Physics-Uspekhi **41**, 441 (1998)]; cond-mat/9912307.

[21] I. M. Suslov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 102, 1951 (1992) [Sov. Phys. JETP 75, 1049 (1992)]; Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 105, 560 (1994) [JETP 79, 307 (1994)]; Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 111, 220 (1997) [JETP 84, 120 (1997)]; Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 111, 1896 (1997) [JETP 84, 1036 (1997)].

[22] I. M. Suslov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **113**, 1460 (1998) [JETP **86**, 798 (1998)]; cond-mat/0007027.

[23] I. M. Suslov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **129**, 1064 (2006) [JETP **102**, 938 (2006)]; cond-mat/0512708.

[24] V. N. Kuzovkov et al, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **14**, 13777 (2002).

V. N. Kuzovkov, W.von Niessen, Eur. Phys. J. B **42**, 529 (2004).

[25] I. M. Suslov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **128**, 768 (2005) [JETP **101**, 661 (2005)]; cond-mat/0504557.

[26] M. Janssen, Phys. Rep. **295**, 1 (1998);

J. L. Pichard, M. Sanquer, Physica A **167**, 66 (1990);

A. M. S. Macedo, J. T. Chalker, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 14985 (1992);

M. Caselle, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 2776 (1995);

C. W. J. Beenakker, B. Rejaei, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 36891 (1993); Phys. Rev. B **49**, 7499 (1994).

[27] E. Abrahams, M. S. Stephen, J. Phys. C **13**, L377 (1980).

[28] P. Markos, B. Kramer, Phil. Mag. **68**, 357 (1993);

P. Markos, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **7**, 8361 (1995);

K. Slevin, Y. Asada, L. I. Deych, cond-mat/0404530

[29] J.Brndiar, P.Markos, cond-mat/0606056.

[30] B. L. Altshuler, V. E. Kravtsov, I. V. Lerner, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **91**, 2276 (1986).

[31] A. Cohen, B. Shapiro, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **6**, 1243 (1992).

[32] I. M. Suslov, cond-mat/0105325, cond-mat/0106357

[33] I. M. Lifshitz, S. A. Gredeskul, L. A. Pastur, Intruduction to the Theory of Disordered Systems, New York, Wiley, 1988.

[34] J.L. Pichard, G. Sarma, J.Phys.C: Solid State Phys. **14**, L127 (1981); **14**, L617 (1981).

[35] A. MacKinnon, B. Kramer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **47**, 1546 (1981).

[36] E. Hofstetter, M. Schreiber, Europhys. Lett. **21**, 933 (1993).

[37] A. MacKinnon, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **6**, 2511 (1994).

[38] K. Slevin, T. Ohtsuki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 382 (1999).

[39] P. Cain, M. L. Ndawana, R. A. Romer, M. Schreiber, cond-mat/0106005.