



ELSEVIER

Available online at [www.sciencedirect.com](http://www.sciencedirect.com)

SCIENCE @ DIRECT®

Physica B 359–361 (2005) 750–752

PHYSICA B

[www.elsevier.com/locate/physb](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/physb)

# Exact results on the two-channel Anderson impurity model: single-electron Green's function and resistivity

Henrik Johannesson<sup>a,\*</sup>, Natan Andrei<sup>b</sup>, Carlos J. Bolech<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Institute of Theoretical Physics, Chalmers University of Technology SE 41296 Göteborg, Sweden and Göteborg University, Sweden*

<sup>b</sup>*Department of Physics, Rutgers University, USA*

<sup>c</sup>*DPMC, Université de Genève, Switzerland*

## Abstract

We exploit our recent boundary conformal field theory description (Johannesson et al., Phys. Rev. B 68 (2003) 075112) of the two-channel Anderson impurity model to construct its exact space- and time-dependent single-electron Green's function. The universal zero-temperature resistivity and leading temperature-dependent term are derived. We discuss possible implications for a quadrupolar-magnetic mixed-valent scenario for the  $\text{UBe}_{13}$  compound.

© 2005 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

PACS: 71.27.+a; 75.20.Hr; 75.40.—s

Keywords: Heavy fermions; Non-Fermi liquids; Quantum impurity problems

The possibility of non-Fermi liquid (NFL) behavior in certain cerium- and uranium-based alloys has been a topic of intense discussion and research ever since the first discovery of the anomalous transport and thermodynamics in these materials [1]. Recently, the two-channel Anderson impurity model was proposed to account for the

NFL physics of  $\text{UBe}_{13}$  [2]. In this model, a low-lying quadrupolar  $5f^2$  doublet mixes with a magnetic  $5f^3$  doublet via the hybridization between the local f orbital and the conduction band:

$$H = H_0 + \varepsilon_s f_\alpha^\dagger f_\sigma + \varepsilon_q b_\alpha^\dagger b_\alpha + V(\psi_{\alpha\sigma}^\dagger(0) b_\alpha^\dagger f_\sigma + f_\sigma^\dagger b_\alpha \psi_{\alpha\sigma}(0)). \quad (1)$$

The free electron Hamiltonian is denoted here by  $H_0$ , with the conduction electrons represented by radial (1D) fields  $\psi_{\alpha\sigma}^\dagger$  carrying spin ( $\sigma = \uparrow, \downarrow$ ) and quadrupolar ( $\alpha = \pm$ ) quantum numbers. The electrons hybridize with the local f levels via the matrix element  $V$ . The quadrupolar [magnetic]

\*Corresponding author. Tel.: +46 31 7723185; fax: +46 31 7723204.

E-mail address: [johannesson@fy.chalmers.se](mailto:johannesson@fy.chalmers.se) (H. Johannesson).

<sup>1</sup>This work was supported by the Swedish Research Council under Contract No. 621-2002-4947, and by a grant from Wilhelm och Martina Lundgrens Vetenskapsfond.

doublet of energy  $\varepsilon_q$  [ $\varepsilon_s$ ] is created by a boson [fermion] operator  $b_\alpha^\dagger$  [ $f_\sigma^\dagger$ ]. Strong Coulomb repulsion implies single occupancy of the localized levels:  $f_\sigma^\dagger f_\sigma + b_\alpha^\dagger b_\alpha = 1$ . For more details, see Ref. [3].

We have applied our recent boundary conformal field theory (BCFT) description of the model [3] to construct its exact space- and time-dependent single-electron Green's function in the limit of low temperatures. Within the BCFT formalism, a quantum impurity gets replaced by a scale-invariant boundary condition on the free electron fields, inserted at the location of the impurity [4]. The specific boundary condition that emulates the presence of the f levels in Eq. (1) was identified in Ref. [3]. The single-electron Green's function picks up a dependence on this boundary condition (alias the impurity) via the one-particle  $S$ -matrix.

$$S_{(1)}(\omega_F) = e^{2i\delta_F} C_{(1)}(\omega_F). \quad (2)$$

Here  $C_{(1)}(\omega_F)$  is the amplitude for a single electron to scatter elastically off the impurity at the Fermi level  $\omega_F$ , and  $\delta_F = \pi n_c/4$  is the corresponding single-electron scattering phase shift, with  $n_c$  the impurity charge valence. Carrying out the same kind of analysis as in Ref. [5] for the two-channel Kondo model (integer valence limit,  $n_c = 1$ , of the present model), we find that  $C_{(1)}(\omega_F) = 0$ , independent of the value of  $n_c$ . In other words, the outgoing scattering state has no remaining single-electron component after interaction with the impurity. This extreme non-Fermi liquid behavior is the same as for the two-channel Kondo model and *is not modified as one moves into the mixed valence regime where  $n_c \neq 0, 1$ .*

Using the BCFT machinery to extract the effective scaling Hamiltonian at low temperatures, a perturbative analysis combined with the result for the one-particle  $S$ -matrix, produces an exact analytic expression for the leading terms of the single-electron Green's function. For a dilute distribution of uncorrelated impurities we obtain the standard form

$$G(\omega_n, k) = \frac{1}{i\omega_n - \varepsilon_k - \Sigma(\omega_n)}, \quad (3)$$

where the Matsubara self-energy  $\Sigma(\omega_n)$  splits into a universal zero-temperature part which is inde-

pendent of frequency  $\omega_n$  and impurity valence  $n_c$ , and a finite- $T$  part which contains two  $n_c$ -dependent “scaling fields”  $\lambda_q$  and  $\lambda_s$  which measure the participation of the quadrupolar and spin degrees of freedom in the scattering of the conduction electrons off the impurity [6].

Having obtained the self-energy  $\Sigma(\omega_n)$  in Eq. (3) we can calculate the resistivity  $\rho$  of the model by analytically continuing  $\Sigma(\omega_n) \rightarrow \Sigma^R(\varepsilon_k)$ , with  $\Sigma^R$  the self-energy of the retarded Green's function. As follows from the analysis in Ref. [7] for this class of problems, vertex corrections to the resistivity involve s-wave correlations which vanish identically. The resistivity is thus determined by the quasi-particle life time

$$\tau(\varepsilon_k) = -\frac{1}{2}(\text{Im } \Sigma^R(\varepsilon_k))^{-1}, \quad (4)$$

via the simple Kubo formula

$$\rho^{-1}(T) = \frac{4e^2}{3m_e} \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \left[ -\frac{dn_F(\varepsilon_k)}{d\varepsilon_k} \right] k^2 \tau(\varepsilon_k). \quad (5)$$

Here  $e$  and  $m_e$  are the electron charge and mass, respectively, with  $n_F(\varepsilon_k)$  the Fermi distribution function. From Eqs. (4) and (5) we obtain

$$\rho(T) = \frac{3n_i}{4\pi(eg_F v_F)^2} (1 - A(n_c)\sqrt{T} + \dots), \quad (6)$$

with “...” denoting subleading temperature corrections. The  $T = 0$  resistivity is universal and is the same as for the two-channel Kondo model [5]. The leading finite- $T$  term also exhibits the same  $\sqrt{T}$  scaling as the two-channel Kondo model, but now with an amplitude  $A(n_c)$  which depends on the impurity valence  $n_c$ . This amplitude can be determined numerically by fitting the BCFT scaling fields  $\lambda_{q,s}$  to the impurity-free energy obtained from the exact *Bethe Ansatz* solution of the model [8]. This work is currently underway [6].

As we mentioned in the introduction, the two-channel single-impurity Anderson model has been proposed as a description of the NFL physics of the UBe<sub>13</sub> alloy [2]. However, our exact result for the resistivity does not support this conjecture: The experimentally observed  $T^2$ -behavior of the low-temperature resistivity for this material [9] is in conflict with the  $T^2$ -scaling in Eq. (6). This may not come as a surprise: The thermodynamics of the model found in Ref. [8] also does not seem to agree

with available experimental data on  $\text{UBe}_{13}$ . Moreover, experimental results for the third-order susceptibility are difficult to explain with the present model [11]. Taken together, these results suggest that additional effects (near-degenerate impurity multiplets [8], excited crystalline electric field states [10], etc.) may have to be taken into account in order to explain the anomalous behavior of this compound.

## References

- [1] For a review, see D.L. Cox, A. Zawadowski, *Adv. Phys.* 47 (1998) 599.
- [2] A. Schiller, F.B. Anders, D.L. Cox, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 81 (1998) 3235.
- [3] H. Johannesson, N. Andrei, C.J. Bolech, *Phys. Rev. B* 68 (2003) 075112.
- [4] I. Affleck, A.W.W. Ludwig, *Nucl. Phys. B* 360 (1991) 641.
- [5] I. Affleck, A.W.W. Ludwig, *Phys. Rev. B* 48 (1993) 7297.
- [6] H. Johannesson, N. Andrei, C.J. Bolech, to appear.
- [7] N.E. Bickers, D.L. Cox, J.W. Wilkins, *Phys. Rev. B* 36 (1987) 2036.
- [8] C.J. Bolech, N. Andrei, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 88 (2002) 237206.
- [9] F. Steglich, et al., *Z. Phys. B* 103 (1997) 235.
- [10] M. Koga, D.L. Cox, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 82 (1999) 2575.
- [11] A.P. Ramirez, P. Chandra, P. Coleman, Z. Fisk, J.L. Smith, H.R. Ott, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 73 (1994) 3018.