

## Diffusion Poles and the Anderson Transition

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

In the recent series of papers (cond-mat/0402471, cond-mat/0403618, cond-mat/0407618, cond-mat/0501586), Janis and Kolorenc discussed the role of the diffusion poles in the Anderson transition theory. Their picture contradicts the general principles and is shown below to be completely misleading. Correct setting of the problem is given and the contemporary situation is discussed. The critical remarks are given on the relation of the diffusion coefficient with multifractality of the wave functions.

The present paper has an aim to discuss the controversy in the literature concerning the role of the diffusion poles in the Anderson transition theory.

1. The spatial dispersion of the diffusion coefficient  $D(\omega, q)$  has a fundamental significance for the whole Anderson transition theory.

It is well known (see e.g. [1, 2]) that a quantity

$$\phi^{RA}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') = \langle G_{E+\omega}^R(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') G_E^A(\mathbf{r}'\mathbf{r}) \rangle \quad (1)$$

in the momentum representation has a diffusion pole

$$\phi^{RA}(q) = \frac{2\pi\nu(E)}{-i\omega + D(\omega, q)q^2} + \phi_{reg}(q), \quad (2)$$

where  $D(\omega, q)$  is the observable diffusion coefficient,  $G^R$  and  $G^A$  are nonaveraged retarded and advanced Green functions for an electron in the random potential,  $\nu(E)$  is a density of states for the energy  $E$ . In the localized phase, the diffusion pole transforms into the Berezinskii-Gorkov singularity

$$\phi^{RA}(q) = \frac{2\pi\nu(E)}{-i\omega} A(q) + \phi_{reg}(q), \quad (3)$$

$$A(q) = \int d\mathbf{r} e^{-i\mathbf{q}\mathbf{r}} A(\mathbf{r}), \quad A(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{\nu(E)} \left\langle \sum_s |\psi_s(\mathbf{r})|^2 |\psi_s(0)|^2 \delta(E - \epsilon_s) \right\rangle, \quad (4)$$

where  $\psi_s(\mathbf{r})$  and  $\epsilon_s$  are eigenfunctions and eigenenergies of the electron in the random potential. In the original paper [3], the  $\delta(\omega)$  singularity (occurring from the terms with  $s = s'$ ) was established for the density correlator

$$S(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') = \frac{1}{\nu(E)} \left\langle \sum_{s,s'} \psi_s^*(\mathbf{r}) \psi_{s'}(\mathbf{r}') \psi_{s'}^*(\mathbf{r}') \psi_s(\mathbf{r}) \delta(E - \epsilon_s) \delta(E + \omega - \epsilon_{s'}) \right\rangle \quad (5)$$

but it can be easily transformed into the  $1/\omega$  singularity for  $\phi^{RA}$  [4, 5, 2]. Comparison of (2) and (3) shows that  $D(\omega, q) \sim \omega$  in the localized phase: a slower dependence would destroy the  $1/\omega$  singularity in Eq. 3 and a more rapid dependence would lead to disappearance of the  $q$ -dependence in the singular part of (2), which surely exists according to Eqs. 3, 4. As a result,

$$D(\omega, q) = -i\omega d(q), \quad (6)$$

where the limit  $\omega \rightarrow 0$  is taken in the function  $d(q)$ . It is easy to see from the relation

$$\frac{1}{1 + d(q)q^2} = A(q) = \int d\mathbf{r} e^{-iq\mathbf{r}} A(\mathbf{r}) \quad (7)$$

that  $d(q)$  is a regular function of  $q^2$ , since all coefficients in the expansion of (7) in the powers of  $q^2$  are finite due to exponential decay of  $A(\mathbf{r})$  at large  $r$ . The analogous regularity in  $q^2$  is expected for  $D(0, q)$  in the metallic state, while the anomalous spatial dispersion of the type  $q^\alpha$  can occur at the transition point.

One can see from Eq. 6, that  $D(0, q) \equiv 0$  in the localized phase; so the Anderson transition does not reduce to vanishing of  $D(0, 0)$  but has essentially more deep nature [6]. The question arises, how the spatial dispersion of  $D$  changes near the Anderson transition. One can suggest, that  $D(0, q)$  vanishes at the transition point simultaneously for all  $q$ . Such possibility looks incredible from viewpoint of phenomenological considerations in the spirit of the Landau theory. Indeed, all expansion coefficients of  $D(0, q)$  in  $q^2$  should vanish simultaneously, irrespective of the way the critical point is approached and its location on the critical surface. Obviously, such vanishing cannot occur by chance, and should be backed by some profound symmetry. Does such a symmetry exist, and what is its origin? If this symmetry is taken for granted, then the order parameter for the Anderson transition should have an infinite number of components. Another possibility suggests, that  $D(0, q)$  vanishes for a single value of  $q$ , and then instability develops (in the spirit of a soft mode) leading to a first-order phase transition. In this case, one has to suggest an appropriate scenario. One can see, that even a type of the Anderson transition cannot be understood without solving the problem of the spatial dispersion of the diffusion coefficient.

The situation is aggravated to the utmost by the existence of the Ward identity [1]

$$\Delta\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{q}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}_1} U_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}_1}(\mathbf{q}) \Delta G_{\mathbf{k}_1}(\mathbf{q}), \quad (8)$$

$$\Delta G_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{q}) \equiv G_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}/2}^R - G_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}/2}^A, \quad \Delta\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{q}) \equiv \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}/2}^R - \Sigma_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}/2}^A \quad (9)$$

where  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{k}}$  is the self energy and  $U_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q})$  is the irreducible 4-vertex appearing in the Bethe-Salpeter equation. This vertex has the diffusion pole for  $\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}' \rightarrow 0$  [1, 2]

$$U_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}) = U_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{reg}(\mathbf{q}) + \frac{F(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}', \mathbf{q})}{-i\omega + D(\omega, \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}')(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}')^2} \quad (10)$$

due to time-reversal invariance. The left-hand side of Eq. 8 is regular at the transition point, whereas the integrand on the right-hand side diverges as  $1/\omega$  in the localized phase

for all  $\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}'$  in the  $\omega \rightarrow 0$  limit. This singularity should be cancelled after integration over  $\mathbf{k}'$ , which involves  $D(\omega, \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}')$  and imposes stringent requirements on the approximation used for calculation of the spatial dispersion of the diffusion coefficient.

2. The first attempt to deal with these problems was made by Vollhardt and Wölfle [1]. They used approximation for  $U_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q})$  suggested by the weak localization theory [7] (corresponding to  $U_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{reg}(\mathbf{q}) = \text{const}$ ,  $F(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}', \mathbf{q}) = \text{const}$  in Eq. 10) and solved approximately the Bethe–Salpeter equation. Their solution corresponds to the following simple estimate. The quantity  $U_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q})$  plays the role of a 'transition probability' in the quantum kinetic equation, and one can use the analogue of the  $\tau$ -approximation,  $D \propto l \propto \langle U \rangle^{-1}$  ( $l$  is the mean free path,  $\langle \dots \rangle$  denotes averaging over the momenta), to obtain the relation

$$D \sim \text{const} \left( U_0 + F_0 \int \frac{d^d q}{-i\omega + D(\omega, q)q^2} \right)^{-1}, \quad (11)$$

coinciding with the self-consistency equation of the Vollhardt and Wölfle theory. With the increase of disorder, the 'transition probability' has anomalous growth due to diminishing of the diffusion coefficient and provides the possibility for vanishing of the latter. If the spatial dispersion of  $D(\omega, q)$  is neglected, Eq. 11 becomes closed and allows to determine the critical exponents for the conductivity  $\sigma$  and the localization length  $\xi$ ,

$$\sigma \sim \tau^s, \quad \xi \sim \tau^{-\nu} \quad (12)$$

( $\tau$  is the distance to the transition). Setting  $D = \text{const}(\omega) \sim \sigma$  in the metallic phase and  $D \sim (-i\omega)\xi^2$  in the localized phase, one can obtain

$$s = 1, \quad d > 2; \quad \nu = \begin{cases} 1/(d-2), & 2 < d < 4 \\ 1/2, & d > 4 \end{cases}. \quad (13)$$

Thus, the Vollhardt and Wölfle theory [1] provides the adequate qualitative description of the Anderson transition. However, due to neglecting the spatial dispersion of  $D(\omega, q)$  the problem of the order parameter symmetry was overlooked, while approximations  $U_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{reg}(\mathbf{q}) = \text{const}$ ,  $F(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}', \mathbf{q}) = \text{const}$  lead to the crude violation of the Ward identity.

The problem of the spatial dispersion of the diffusion coefficient manifests itself also in the  $\sigma$ -models formalism [8], which is usually considered as the most rigorous approach to the localization theory. These models are derived by using the saddle-point approximation for integration over 'hard' degrees of freedom in the functional integral and subsequent expansion in gradients. The 'minimal'  $\sigma$ -model contains only the lowest (second) powers of gradients and corresponds to neglecting the spatial dispersion of the diffusion coefficient. One can suspect that it violates self-consistency of the theory. Attempt to take the spatial dispersion of  $D(\omega, q)$  into account and include the terms with higher gradients into the Lagrangian of the  $\sigma$ -model leads to anomalous growth of these terms in the course of the renormalization-group transformations [9]: the so called 'high-gradient catastrophe' occurs. The stable fixed point, corresponding to the true spatial dispersion, is still not found.

The problem of the Ward identity was completely solved in the paper [2]. The crucial point consists in the use of the spectral representation for the quantum collision operator  $\hat{L}$  (which is the quantum analogue of the Boltzman collision operator). Then cancellation of the  $1/\omega$  singularity in the right-hand side of Eq. 8 follows from the orthogonality relations for eigenvectors of  $\hat{L}$ . At present, the spectral representation for the operator  $\hat{L}$  looks as a necessary ingredient of any consistent theory of the Anderson transition: it is the only place where approximations can be safely made without violation of the Ward identity.

The paper [2] deals also with the general problem of evaluation  $D(\omega, q)$  near the Anderson transition. It appears, that the spectrum of the operator  $\hat{L}$  possesses the non-trivial hierarhial structure. The condition of stability of this hierarhy in respect to infinitesimal perturbations can be expressed in a form of a self-consistency equation, which replaces the crude Eq. 11. Solution of this equation is seeked for an arbitrary form of the spatial dispersion of  $D(\omega, q)$ , but self-consistency is reached only for the solution with the weak  $q$ -dependence. As a consequence, estimation of the integral in Eq. 11 remains unchanged and we return to the result (13) for the critical exponents.

The paper [2] takes into account only evident symmetry of the system and considers a situation of the general position, compatible with this symmetry. Such reasoning is typical for the mean field theory and may be wrong due to existence of hidden symmetry. However, there are arguments that the theory [2] is something more than the mean field theory. Indeed, the existence of hidden symmetry is expected only for the critical point itself; as a result, the mean-field theory does not give the true critical behavior, but correctly describes the change of symmetry. From viewpoint of the change of symmetry, the Anderson transition is similar to the Curie point for an isotropic  $n$ -component ferromagnet in the limit of  $n \rightarrow \infty$ : it is related with simultaneous vanishing of all coefficients in the expansion of  $D(0, q)$  over  $q^2$ . The model of an infinite-component ferromagnet is exactly solvable [10] and its critical exponents appear to be in complete agreement with the results (13) of the straightforward analysis. This is an argument, that the symmetry of the critical point is established correctly and that the critical exponents are determined exactly.

Another argument is given by the fact that Eq. 13 agrees with practically all reliable analytical results obtained for specific models [2, 11], and with experimental results  $s \approx 1$ ,  $\nu \approx 1$  for  $d = 3$  [12, 13] obtained independently in the measurements of conductivity and the dielectric constant. It agrees also with the one-parameter scaling hypothesis [14], though not one word about scaling was said in derivation of the self-consistency equation. Unfortunately, the results (13) are in a serious contradiction with numerical experiments [15], though the latter have their own problems [16], being in conflict not only with (13) but also with some rigorous theorems.

In conclusion, a scenario of the Anderson transition suggested in Ref. 2 cannot be considered as rigorously established but has the good perspectives to be exact. At present, it is the only scheme which makes it possible to analyse the spatial dispersion of the diffusion coefficient near the critical point.

3. In the current literature, behavior of the diffusion coefficient near the Anderson

transition is discussed in terms of one-parameter scaling [17], and the following ansatz is used for a critical point [18]

$$D(\omega, q) \sim \omega^{\eta/d} q^{d-2-\eta}. \quad (14)$$

The exponents in Eq. 14 are chosen in such way that the static diffusion coefficient  $D_L$  of a finite system of size  $L$ , determined from  $D(\omega, q)$  by relation

$$D_L \sim D(D_L/L^2, 1/L),$$

has a behavior  $D_L \sim L^{2-d}$  predicted by the one-parameter scaling theory [14]. Relation  $\eta = d - D_2$  was claimed [19], connecting the exponent  $\eta$  with the fractal dimension  $D_2$  of wave functions. Numerical results for  $\eta$  and  $D_2$  in three dimensions have a large scattering ( $D_2 = 1.7 \pm 0.3$  [20],  $D_2 = 1.6 \pm 0.1$  [21],  $D_2 = 1.33 \pm 0.02$  [22],  $\eta = 1.2 \pm 0.15$ ,  $\eta = 1.3 \pm 0.2$ ,  $\eta = 1.5 \pm 0.3$  [19],  $D_2 = 1.68$  [23],  $D_2 = 1.30 \pm 0.05$  [24],  $D_2 = 1.28 \pm 0.02$  [25]) but in general show violation of an equality  $\eta = 1$ , which follows from the analysis of Ref. 2. It is possible to consider this fact as an evidence of hidden symmetry neglected in [2]. However, few critical remarks can be made in relation with the cited researches.

(a) The analysis in [18, 19] is based on the relation between the Fourier transform of the density correlator (5) and the diffusion coefficient

$$S(\omega, q) \sim \frac{D(\omega, q)q^2}{\omega^2 + [D(\omega, q)q^2]^2}, \quad (15)$$

which is valid only for real  $D(\omega, q)$ . The general relation can be found in [2] and is given there by Eq. 31:

$$S(\omega, q) \sim \frac{1}{\omega} \text{Im} \frac{D(\omega, q)q^2}{-i\omega + D(\omega, q)q^2}. \quad (16)$$

It is clear from the above discussion that the low frequency diffusion coefficient is real in the metallic state and pure imaginary in the localized phase, while a complicated rearrangement of its analytical structure occurs in the vicinity of the transition point. Thus, the most delicate feature of the Anderson transition is completely ignored in [18, 19].

In fact, only one real quantity  $S(\omega, q)$  is measured in numerical experiments, and one cannot extract two functions  $\text{Re} D(\omega, q)$  and  $\text{Im} D(\omega, q)$  from such a measurement<sup>1</sup>. We see, that numerical experiments do not provide any direct information on the diffusion coefficient. All conclusions concerning  $D(\omega, q)$  are based on strong assumptions and cannot be considered as reliable.

(b) In our opinion, there is some problem with the relation  $\eta = d - D_2$ . According to Wegner [26],  $D_2 = 2 - \epsilon$  in the  $(2 + \epsilon)$ -dimensional case, suggesting  $\eta = 2\epsilon$ . However, Wegner's result was obtained for the 'minimal'  $\sigma$ -model, where the spatial dispersion of  $D(\omega, q)$  is neglected (see Sec. 2 above); it looks as internal inconsistency.

---

<sup>1</sup> In principle, one can use the Kramers–Kronig relation and obtain a closed system of equations for these quantities, but the contemporary algorithms are far from fulfilling this program.

(c) The fractal dimension  $D_2$  is determined by the behavior of the participation ratio  $P$  as a function of the system size  $L$ ,  $P \sim L^{D_2}$ . Theoretically, such behavior is expected only for the critical disorder  $W_c$ , but in practice the power law dependences  $P \sim L^\alpha$  are observed for wide range of disorder [21] (see a detailed discussion in [27]). In order the measurement of  $D_2$  was possible, the value  $W_c$  is taken from other experiments, which are not directly related with the properties of wave functions. Analysis of the contemporary situation shows [16] that essential revision of the conventional results for  $W_c$  is practically inevitable. As a result, a value  $D_2$  can change essentially.

4. Relation of the diffusion poles with the Anderson transition was discussed recently in the series of papers by Janis and Kolorenc [28–31], where the following conclusions were reached:

- (i) Existence of the diffusion pole in the localized phase is incompatible with the Ward identity;
- (ii) The diffusion pole is absent in the localized phase;
- (iii) The Ward identity is violated due to the averaging procedure.

The initial point for these conclusions is the solution for the two-particle Green function obtained for high dimensionalities of space  $d$ , which (according to the authors) is asymptotically exact in the parameter  $d^{-1}$  [28]. This solution does not possess the diffusion pole in the localized phase and does not satisfy the Ward identity. Instead to seek an origin of this surely defective result, the authors of [28–31] become anxious to defend it. Using reasonable, but unjustified form of  $U_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q})$ , they came to conclusion on the principal impossibility to satisfy the Ward identity in the localized phase [29]. Its violation is argued by possibility that the Hilbert space of the eigenfunctions becomes incomplete due to the averaging procedure [30].

We have specially stressed in Sec.1, that in order to satisfy the Ward identity one needs very delicate approximations: they should be not only asymptotically exact in some parameter but should be made 'in the proper place'<sup>2</sup>. We see nothing unusual that the results for high dimensions are not self-consistent, even if they are really correct in the leading order in  $d^{-1}$ . Indeed, the formal expansion of the right-hand side of Eq.8 in powers of  $d^{-1}$  may contain the well defined zero order term, while divergent integrals may occur in the higher orders. Consequently, the result of [28] for high dimensions does not provide the reliable foundation for further conclusions.

The statement (i) on the principal impossibility of satisfying the Ward identity in the localized phase (based on approximate structure of  $U_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q})$ ) contradicts the rigorous analysis of the paper [2]. The  $1/\omega$  singularity in the right-hand side of Eq.8 is inevitably cancelled if the spectral properties of the quantum collision operator  $\hat{L}$  are taken into account.

---

<sup>2</sup> There is nothing new in these considerations. It is well known that the first correction to the self energy has essentially more sense than the first correction to the Green function; the one-loop approximation for the Gell-Mann - Low function is more effective than the one-loop approximation to the invariant charge, and so on.

The statement (ii) on the absence of the diffusion pole in the localized phase contradicts the existence of the Berezinskii-Gorkov singularity  $1/\omega$ , which can be obtained not only in the framework of the self-consistent theory [1] (which is cited in [28–31]) but by direct analysis of the density correlator [3, 4, 5, 2] and in the framework of the instanton approach [4, 32]. This singularity is closely related with the Anderson criterion of localization [33] in modification by Economou and Cohen [34] (see [4] and [32]), which can be rigorously proved for  $1D$  systems [35]. In fact, the existence of the  $1/\omega$  singularity can be easily seen for a zero-dimensional case, which corresponds to the Anderson model on a single site. The exact Green function

$$G^R(E) = \frac{1}{E - V + i0} \quad (17)$$

after trivial averaging takes a form

$$\langle G^R(E) \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{P(V) dV}{E - V + i0} \quad (18)$$

( $P(V)$  is a distribution of  $V$ ), giving a density of states

$$\nu(E) = -\frac{1}{\pi} \text{Im} \langle G^R(E) \rangle = P(E). \quad (19)$$

Then the quantity  $\phi^{RA}$ ,

$$\phi^{RA} = \langle G^R(E + \omega) G^A(E) \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{E - V + \omega + i0} \frac{1}{E - V - i0} P(V) dV, \quad (20)$$

has the  $1/\omega$  singularity for  $\omega \rightarrow 0$ ,

$$\phi^{RA} = \frac{2\pi P(E)}{-i\omega}, \quad (21)$$

in accordance with Eq. 3 (the momentum dependence is absent in the zero-dimensional case, and all momenta are supposed to be equal to zero; so  $q = 0$  and  $A(0) = 1$ ). The results (17–21) are also valid for a space of arbitrary dimensionality in the limit of strong disorder. Already these simple results are not reproduced by sophisticated expressions in [28–31].

It is well known, that the coherent potential approximation (CPA), considering as formally exact in the leading order in  $d^{-1}$ , has an essential qualitative defect [36]: it does not describe the fluctuational tail of the density of states, which is exponentially small and cannot be found in any finite order of perturbation theory. This tail can be explicitly calculated by the instanton method both for  $d < 4$  [32, 37, 38] and for higher dimensions [39, 11]<sup>3</sup>. According to [4, 32], the Berezinskii-Gorkov singularity has also nonperturbative origin, and it is naturally not reproduced by the extension of CPA used in [28–31].

---

<sup>3</sup> Absence of instantons for  $d > 4$  [40] should not be considered as the absence of localized states [41]. The theory is not renormalizable for  $d > 4$  and should be considered on the lattice. The lattice instantons always exist.

The statement (iii) on the possible violation of the Ward identity due to the averaging procedure [30] is based mainly on philosophical considerations. In principle, such argumentation may be correct in some situations, but it has nothing to do with the present case: the Ward identity (8) was diagrammatically derived in [1] directly for the averaged quantities. Of course, one can discuss the possible nonperturbative contributions, but at the present case there is no ground for them: validity of the Ward identity corresponds to the physical requirements, and its violation is not expected. In fact, the mystical fear of nonperturbative contributions is not grounded: such contributions can be safely extracted from the diagrammatic expansions [11] if a correct procedure for summing of divergent series is chosen [42].

One can see, that all statements (i),(ii),(iii) are incorrect. The authors of [28–31] were wrecked on the 'hidden rocks', which were discovered many years ago.

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

## References

- [1] D. Vollhardt and P. Wölfle, Phys. Rev. B **22**, 4666 (1980); Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 699 (1982); in Modern Problems in Condensed Matter Sciences, edited by V. M. Agranovich and A. A. Maradudin, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1992, Vol. 32.
- [2] I. M. Suslov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **108**, 1686 (1995) [JETP **81**, 925 (1995)]; cond-mat/0111407.
- [3] V. L. Berezinskii and L. P. Gor'kov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **77**, 2498 (1979) [Sov. Phys. JETP **50**, 1209 (1979)].
- [4] M. V. Sadovskii, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **83**, 1418 (1982) [Sov. Phys. JETP **56**, 816 (1982)].
- [5] M. V. Sadovskii, Sov. Sci. Rev. A. Phys. **7**, 1 (1986).
- [6] K. B. Efetov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **88**, 1032 (1985) [Sov. Phys. JETP **61**, 606 (1985)].
- [7] 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.
- [8] F. Wegner, Z. Phys. B **35**, 207 (1979); L. Schäfer, F. Wegner, Z. Phys. B **38**, 113 (1980). S. Hikami, Phys. Rev. B **24**, 2671 (1981).  
K. B. Efetov, A. I. Larkin, D. E. Khmel'nitskii, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **79**, 1120 (1980) [Sov. Phys. JETP **52**, 568 (1980)].  
K. B. Efetov, Adv. Phys. **32**, 53 (1983).



- [9] 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).
- [10] S. Ma, Modern Theory of Critical Phenomena, Reading, Mass.: W.A.Benjamin, Advanced Book Program, 1976.
- [11] I. M. Suslov, Usp. Fiz. Nauk **168**, 503 (1998) [Physics-Uspekhi **41**, 441 (1998)]; cond-mat/9912307.
- [12] D. Belitz, T. R. Kirkpatrick, Rev. Mod. Phys., **66**, 261 (1994).
- [13] N. G. Zhdanova, M. S. Kagan, E. G. Landsberg, JETP **90**, 662 (2000). This experiment is made on the nondegenerate electron gas and there is no question on influence of interaction.
- [14] E. Abrahams, P. W. Anderson, D. C. Licciardello, and T. V. Ramakrishnan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **42**, 673 (1979).
- [15] P. Markos, cond-mat/0609580.
- [16] I. M. Suslov, cond-mat/0610744.
- [17] E. Abrahams, P.A.Lee, Phys. Rev. B **33**, 683 (1986).
- [18] J. T. Chalker, Physica A **167**, 253 (1990).
- [19] T. Brandes, B. Huckestein, L. Schweitzer, Ann. Phys. **5**, 633 (1996).
- [20] C. M. Soukolis, E. N. Economou, Phys. Rev. Lett. **52**, 565 (1984).
- [21] M. Schreiber, J. Phys. C **18**, 2490 (1985); Physica A **167**, 188 (1990).
- [22] S. N. Evangelou, Physica A **167**, 199 (1990).
- [23] M. Schreiber, H. Grussbach, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 607 (1991).
- [24] A. Mildenerger, F. Evers, A. D. Mirlin, Phys. Rev. B **66**, 033109 (2002).
- [25] J. Brndiar, P. Markos, cond-mat/0606056.
- [26] F. Wegner, Z. Phys. B **36**, 209 (1980).
- [27] I. M. Suslov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **129**, 1064 (2006) [JETP **102**, 938 (2005)]; cond-mat/0512708.
- [28] V. Janis, J. Kolorenc, Phys. Rev. B **71**, 033103 (2005), cond-mat/0402471.

- [29] V. Janis, J. Kolorenc, Phys. Stat. Sol. B **241**, 2032 (2004), cond-mat/0403618.
- [30] V. Janis, J. Kolorenc, cond-mat/0407618.
- [31] V. Janis, J. Kolorenc, Phys. Rev. B **71**, 245106 (2005), cond-mat/0501586.
- [32] J. L. Cardy, J. Phys. C **11**, L321 (1978).
- [33] P. W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. **109**, 1492 (1958).
- [34] E. N. Economou, M. H. Cohen, Phys. Rev. B **5**, 2931 (1972).
- [35] K. Ishii, Progr. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **53**, 77 (1973).
- [36] D. J. Thouless, Phys. Rep. **13**, 92 (1974).
- [37] M. V. Sadovskii, Fiz. Tverd. Tela (Leningrad) **21**, 743 (1979).
- [38] E. Brezin, G. Parisi, J. Phys. C **13**, L307 (1980).
- [39] 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)].
- [40] V. G. Makhankov, Phys. Lett. **61A**, 431 (1977).
- [41] D. J. Thouless, J. Phys. C **9**, L603 (1976).
- [42] I. M. Suslov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **127**, 1350 (2005) [JETP **100**, 1188 (2005)]; cond-mat/0510142.