

Spin and thermal conductivity in classical disordered spin chain

B. Jenčič¹ and P. Prelovšek^{1,2}

¹*J. Stefan Institute, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia and*

²*Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, University of Ljubljana, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia*

Transport quantities of the classical spin chain with the quenched disorder in the antiferromagnetic coupling J_i are evaluated using the dynamical simulation at finite temperatures $T > 0$. Since the classical model is nonintegrable, spin and thermal conductivities remain finite even in the pure case. On the other hand, the role of disorder becomes crucial at low T leading to a vanishing transport due to the Anderson localization within the linearized regime. The crossover from the insulator to the conductor appears both for the spin and thermal transport at quite low $T^* \ll J$. Still the many-body localization regime at $T > 0$ evidenced by extremely short mean free paths can be strongly enhanced by introducing into the model an additional staggered field.

PACS numbers: 66.70.-f, 75.10.Hk, 75.10.Pq, 75.40.Gb

I. INTRODUCTION

Properties of low-dimensional spin systems have been investigated intensively since many decades. Since the one-dimensional (1D) $S = 1/2$ antiferromagnetic (AFM) Heisenberg model is the first quantum many-body model considered theoretically and its ground state properties are exactly solvable by the Bethe Ansatz¹, it has been the playground for numerous analytical and numerical approaches. In recent decades, experimental realisations of the spin-chain physics has been found in several classes of materials, the best and nearly ideal example of the isotropic Heisenberg $S = 1/2$ model being cuprates^{2,3}. A particular signature of the 1D $S = 1/2$ model and its integrability are transport properties which are anomalous⁴. It has been shown that the heat transport is dissipationless at any temperature $T > 0$ ^{5,6}, at the same time also the spin conductivity (diffusivity) is infinite (ballistic) in the anisotropic easy-plane regime (anisotropy $\Delta < 1$) at any $T > 0$ ⁷.

In contrast to clean spin chains the transport in disordered systems is much less understood and represents a challenge and very active theoretical topic. It is well established that in a quantum $S = 1/2$ AFM Heisenberg chain and more generally in the system of 1D repulsive fermions at $T = 0$ any random quenched disorder induces localisation and the vanishing of transport coefficients^{8,9}. This is the consequence of the Anderson localisation phenomenon¹⁰⁻¹² in 1D persisting or even enhanced in the presence of interaction within the ground state. The scenario of the many-body (quantum) localisation (MBL)¹³⁻¹⁵ which would manifest itself with the localisation and no d.c. transport at $T > 0$ is investigated intensively at present, mostly within the random Heisenberg model. So far the evidence for the latter has been found in numerical solutions of strongly disordered $S = 1/2$ AFM model with random local fields^{14,15}, while some studies indicate more on a crossover into a nearly localised regime^{16,17}. We note that there are recently experimental realisations of disordered (but isotropic) spin $S = 1/2$ chains $\text{BaCu}_2(\text{Si}_{1-x}\text{Ge}_x)\text{O}_7$ ¹⁸, $\text{Cu}(\text{py})_2(\text{Cl}_{1-x}\text{Br}_x)_2$ ¹⁹ and Ca-doped Sr_2CuO_3 ²⁰, where the disorder enters predominantly via random exchange couplings J_i and has been theoretically studied in connection with the concept of random singlets²¹⁻²⁴.

The classical AFM spin-chain model, which can be regarded as the $S \rightarrow \infty$ limit of the quantum model, is numerically much easier to deal with. Without disorder the spin dynamics of is nonlinear and nonintegrable, hence one obtains at $T > 0$ finite transport coefficients²⁵, unlike to $S = 1/2$ model⁵ but on the other hand closer to $S \geq 1$ cases²⁶. Still, the role of disorder bears some analogies to the MBL when considering low but finite $T > 0$. Namely, in the low T regime one can imagine the transport being dominated by linear excitations which exhibit the Anderson localization in a random system^{11,12}. Numerical studies of the classical model so far performed at $T \rightarrow \infty$ ²⁷ did not reveal the absence of diffusion. In the following we perform the numerical study of the d.c. spin conductivity σ_s and the thermal conductivity κ within classical spin model in the whole T regime. We show that indeed at low $T \rightarrow 0$ both coefficients vanish due to the localization phenomena. Here the fundamental question is whether the (classical analogue) of the MBL persists in a finite T window. We find the evidence only for a insulator-conductor crossover regime, in this sense consistent with studies of transport in disordered anharmonic chains²⁸. Still, the quasi-insulating regime characterized by extremely short spin and thermal mean free paths (MFP) $l_{s,t} \ll 1$ and the crossover temperature T^* can be strongly extended by introducing a constant staggered field. In spite of strong T dependence, both transport MFP qualitatively satisfy the simple Wiedemann-Franz law²⁹ $l_s \sim l_t$.

The paper is organised as follows. In Sec. II we introduce the disordered classical 1D spin-chain model. We define the appropriate spin and thermal currents as well as the linear-response equations for the d.c. spin conductivity σ_s and the thermal conductivity κ . In Sec. III we describe the numerical protocol for the the initial spin configuration corresponding to the equilibrium at chosen temperature T and further simulation of the spin dynamics and calculation of d.c. transport properties. Results for $\sigma_s(T)$ and $\kappa(T)$ are presented in Sec. IV for various disorder and the whole range of T . A particular analysis in terms of corresponding mean free paths l_s, l_t , respectively, is given in Sec. V and discussed in relation with the Wiedemann-Franz ratio $W = l_t/l_s$.

II. MODEL AND TRANSPORT QUANTITIES

We consider in the following the 1D AFM isotropic model of classical spins (rotors) $\mathbf{S}_i = S\mathbf{e}_i$,

$$H = \sum_i J_i \mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i+1} - \sum_i \mathbf{B}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_i, \quad (1)$$

where \mathbf{e}_i are unit vectors and (exchange) couplings $J_i > 0$ are antiferromagnetic on all bonds but random, in analogy with the $S = 1/2$ case²¹⁻²³. We also choose J_i randomly distributed within an interval $J - \delta J \leq J_i \leq J + \delta J$ (with $\delta J < J$ so there is no possibility of cutting a chain) and are as well uncorrelated between sites. Since we fix furtheron $S = 1$, $J = 1$ and the lattice parameter $a = 1$ the only relevant parameter (in the absense of local fields, $B_i = 0$) is the disorder strength $0 < \delta J \leq 1$. Our study deals with the disorder in the off-diagonal J_i , the motivation being also in the material realisations where random fields \mathbf{B}_i are hard to justify. Nevertheless, we also comment on the influence of the staggered field $\mathbf{B}_i = (-1)^i B\mathbf{e}_z$ which can, e.g., emerge as a mean field due to interchain coupling²⁴. We show that $B \neq 0$ has a very strong effect on transport at $T \rightarrow 0$. It should be also reminded that the thermal transport in the classical model with random \mathbf{B}_i has been studied for $T \rightarrow \infty$ ²⁷.

The equations of motion for the classical model, Eq. (1), are

$$\frac{d\mathbf{S}_i}{dt} = -\mathbf{S}_i \times \frac{\partial H}{\partial \mathbf{S}_i} = -\mathbf{S}_i \times (J_{i-1}\mathbf{S}_{i-1} + J_i\mathbf{S}_{i+1} - \mathbf{B}_i). \quad (2)$$

Our aim is to study the spin current j_s and the energy current j_E which are defined via the continuity equations^{16,25},

$$\frac{\partial S_i^z}{\partial t} = -(j_{i+1}^s - j_i^s), \quad \frac{\partial h_i}{\partial t} = -(j_{i+1}^E - j_i^E), \quad (3)$$

where h_i is the local energy

$$h_i = \frac{1}{2} [J_{i-1}\mathbf{S}_{i-1} \cdot \mathbf{S}_i + J_i\mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i+1}] - \mathbf{B}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_i, \quad (4)$$

The explicit expression for both currents then follow,

$$\begin{aligned} j_i^s &= J_i (S_i^x S_{i+1}^y - S_i^y S_{i+1}^x), \\ j_i^E &= \frac{1}{2} J_{i-1} [J_{i-2}(\mathbf{S}_{i-2} \times \mathbf{S}_{i-1}) \cdot \mathbf{S}_i + J_i(\mathbf{S}_{i-1} \times \mathbf{S}_i) \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i+1}] \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} J_{i-1} (\mathbf{S}_{i-1} \times \mathbf{S}_i) \cdot (\mathbf{B}_{i-1} + \mathbf{B}_i). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

The d.c. spin conductivity σ_s and the thermal conductivity κ are within the (Kubo) linear response given through correlation functions³⁰,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_s &= \frac{1}{LT} \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^\tau \langle J^s(t) J^s(0) \rangle dt, \\ \kappa &= \frac{1}{LT^2} \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^\tau \langle J^E(t) J^E(0) \rangle dt, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where $J^s = \sum j_i^s$ and $J^E = \sum j_i^E$ are total spin and energy currents, respectively. We also put $k_B = 1$ so that $T \equiv Tk_B/JS^2$, $\sigma_s \equiv \sigma_s/(Sa^3)$ and $\kappa \equiv \kappa/(k_B J S a^3)$ are all dimensionless.

III. NUMERICAL PROCEDURE

Thermal values of $\sigma_s(T)$ and $\kappa(T)$ for given T and disorder δJ are calculated numerically in two steps. First, we use modified Landau-Lifshitz-Gilbert (LLG) equations for spin dynamics³¹, in order to thermalise the system to given T , i.e., to find the T -dependent initial spin configurations²⁵,

$$\frac{d\mathbf{S}_i}{dt} = \frac{\mathbf{S}_i}{1 + \alpha^2} \times \left[\xi_i - \frac{\partial H}{\partial \mathbf{S}_i} - \alpha \mathbf{S}_i \times \left(\xi_i - \frac{\partial H}{\partial \mathbf{S}_i} \right) \right]. \quad (7)$$

with a damping parameter α , and ξ_i representing random vectors due to $T > 0$ thermostat, with properties of the Gaussian white noise,

$$\langle \xi_i(t) \rangle = 0, \quad \langle \xi_i(t_1) \cdot \xi_j(t_2) \rangle = 2\alpha T \delta_{ij} \delta(t_1 - t_2), \quad (8)$$

In the concrete numerical realisation we perform the calculation on $L = 10000$ sites. The LLG thermalization, Eqs. (7),(8), we independently check via Boltzmann thermodynamic value of the energy $E(T) = \langle H \rangle$. Clearly for $T \ll J$ longer thermalization times t_0 are required so that we employ $t_0 \sim 1000$. Furtheron final LLG spin configurations are used as initial conditions for dynamical spin evolution via Eq. (2) where we use the standard fourth-order Runge-Kutta with the small time step $\delta t \sim 0.01$ (tested by the conservation of spin norm $S = 1$ and the total energy E) and the evolution times up to $\tau \sim 10000$. Kubo formulas, Eqs. (6), are then used to evaluate $\sigma_s(T)$ and $\kappa(T)$ at various disorders δJ .

Such a protocol for the evaluation of transport properties, standard for generic (ergodic) systems, should be carefully reconsidered and tested for our model, being a candidate for the MBL phenomenon. In the case of MBL one could expect in an isolated system the lack of thermalisation, dependence of the (long-time) linear response on the initial conditions etc. Still, as shown later our results do not confirm the strict MBL behavior (except at very low T) and consistently the initial conditions do not influence the final result. Still the closeness to MBL manifest itself in long thermalisation and evolution times $t_0, \tau \gg 1$.

IV. RESULTS: SPIN AND THERMAL CONDUCTIVITIES

In Fig. 1 we present numerical results for the T dependence of the renormalized $\tilde{\sigma}_s = T\sigma_s$ and $\tilde{\kappa} = T^2\kappa$. It follows from Eqs. (6) that such redefined $\tilde{\sigma}_s, \tilde{\kappa}$ remain finite (and constant) at $T \rightarrow \infty$. Obtained results already reveal general features of the d.c. transport in pure and disordered classical chains:

a) In contrast to the quantum $S = 1/2$ spin-chain model⁵ in the classical model both $\sigma_s(T)$ and $\kappa(T)$ are finite for $T > 0$, even without disorder at $\delta J = 0$ ²⁵.

b) From Fig. 1 it is evident that $\tilde{\sigma}(T)$ and $\tilde{\kappa}(T)$ are both approaching constants at $T > 0.5$ for any disorder δJ . Our results for the clean case $\delta J = 0$ for $\tilde{\kappa}_\infty = \tilde{\kappa}(T \rightarrow \infty) \sim 0.55$ are consistent with the one previously obtained²⁵.

c) Instead of spin conductivity σ_s more often considered quantity is the spin diffusivity D_s , determined by the relation $D_s = \sigma_s/\chi_s$ ³² where $\chi_s = \langle (S_{tot}^z)^2 \rangle / LT$ is the uniform spin




Figure 1. (Color online) Temperature dependence of renormalized: a) spin conductivity $\tilde{\sigma}_s = T\sigma_s$, and b) thermal conductivity $\tilde{\kappa} = T^2\kappa$ for various disorders $\delta J = 0 - 0.8$.

susceptibility. Taking into account $\chi_s(T \rightarrow \infty) = 1/(3T)$ and our value from Fig. 1a $\tilde{\sigma}_\infty = \tilde{\sigma}_s(T \rightarrow \infty) \sim 0.25$ we would get the limit $\tilde{D}_s(T \rightarrow \infty) \sim 0.75$ which can be well compared with the high- T expansion result for the classical case $\tilde{D}_s(T \rightarrow \infty) = (2/5)\sqrt{10/3} = 0.73^{33}$ (note the correction in Ref.³⁴).

d) It is plausible that the disorder $\delta J > 0$ reduces both $\tilde{\kappa}_\infty$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_\infty$. While for weaker disorder, e.g. $\delta J = 0.2$, the $T \rightarrow \infty$ transport is not much effected by the randomness, the dependence is more pronounced for $\delta J > 0.4$, in particular for $\tilde{\kappa}_\infty$. The latter difference can be partly traced back to the explicit forms of j_i^s and j_i^E , Eqs. (5), where the exchange coupling and their disorder enters linearly in j_i^s , but quadratically in j_i^E .

f) Both $\sigma_s(T)$ and $\kappa(T)$ are not diverging or approaching finite values, but rather vanishing in the regime $T \rightarrow 0$ (more evident in later plots). The latter T window is quite narrow but numerically well resolved. The absence of transport at $T \rightarrow 0$ is a direct indication of the localization phenomenon. Namely, Eqs. (2) can be linearized around the AFM ground state $\mathbf{S}_i^0 = (-1)^i \mathbf{e}_z$. Resulting eigen-solutions of linear equations, Eq. (2), for S_i^x (or S_i^y) are then localised according to the Anderson localisation^{11,12,28} in 1D systems. To confirm the onset of localisation we present in Fig. 2 a typical example of local spin deviations δS_i^x obtained as the solution of the linearized Eqs. (2) for large disorder $\delta J = 0.8$ and low $T = 0.02$. It is, however, evident (see later) that the validity and feasibility of such a linear approximation is restricted to very low $T \ll 1$ at $B = 0$, but can be substantially enhanced with the staggered field $B > 0$.




Figure 2. (Color online) An example of local spin deviations emerging from the linearized Eqs. (2) in case of $\delta J = 0.8$ and $T \sim 0.02$.

V. TRANSPORT MEAN FREE PATHS AND WIEDEMANN-FRANZ RATIO

It is instructive to analyse the transport data (with the emphasis on low $T \ll J$) through the phenomenology of the standard kinetic theory. One can introduce the concept of thermal (heat) MFP l_t which is in our case the transport MFP of AFM magnons representing the relevant low- T excitations with a constant magnon velocity $v = 2J$ (emerging from the classical AFM dispersion $\epsilon_q = 2J \sin q$). l_t then enters the thermal conductivity as $\kappa = C_V v l_t$ where $C_V = (1/L)dE/dT$ is the specific heat of the system. On the other hand, the spin-diffusion MFP l_s can be most reasonably extracted via the diffusion constant $D_s = v l_s$. In general both MFP are different $l_s(T) \neq l_t(T)$.




Figure 3. (Color online) Specific heat C_V and uniform susceptibility χ_s vs. T for the pure case $\delta J = 0$ and different values of the staggered field B .

In Fig. 3 we first present $C_V(T)$ as well as $\chi_s(T)$, needed to evaluate l_t and l_s , respectively. Their dependence on disorder δJ (not presented) is quite weak. More significant and impor-

tant for further discussion is the dependence on the staggered field B . We note that in contrast to the well known $S = 1/2$ quantum case at $B = 0$ the classical model has a different low- T dependence for $C_V \sim k_B$ at $T \ll J$, while for $T > J$ one gets $C_V \sim 1/(3T^2)$. On the other hand, the behavior of $\chi_s(T)$ has at $B = 0$ a similarity to the 1D $S = 1/2$ AFM, approaching a constant for $T \rightarrow 0$.




Figure 4. (Color online) Transport mean free paths vs. T : a) spin diffusion $l_s(T)$, b) the thermal $l_t(T)$, and c) the Wiedemann-Franz ratio $W = l_t/l_s$ for different disorder strength $\delta J = 0 - 0.8$ and $B = 0$. Note the log scale.

In Fig. 4 we show (note the log scale) the extracted T dependence of the spin and thermal MFP $l_{s,t}$, respectively, for $B = 0$ but different disorder $0 \geq \delta J < 1$. The qualitative and even quantitative behavior of both quantities is quite similar which is not surprising since the equality $l_t \sim l_s$ would indicate the validity of the Wiedemann-Franz law²⁹ even for this system. First we note that for a pure system $\delta J = 0$ both MFP increase and diverge by lowering $T \rightarrow 0$ which is a normal behavior²⁵ emerging from restricted scattering processes at $T \rightarrow 0$. At higher $T > 0.1$ finite disorder $\delta J > 0$ reduces both MFP, but does not change the qualitative behavior. In contrast, at low $T < T^*$ whereby the crossover T^* we define by $l_{s,t}(T^*) = \max$. the Anderson localization mechanism sets in and the trend turns, i.e., $l_{s,t}(T \rightarrow 0) \rightarrow 0$. It is plausible that T^* is increasing with δJ , still it is quite puzzling that the crossover appears very low, typically at $T^* \leq 0.05 \ll 1$. This implies that even at $T > 0.1$ nonlinear excitations become dominant over linear excitations, having analogy to AFM magnons. It should be

also noted that our results reveal (at $B = 0$) even at modest $\delta J > 0.4$ a narrow but numerically well resolved regime $T < 0.01 < T^*$, where both MFP become smaller than the lattice spacing $l_{s,t} < 1$.

In order to enhance the localization regime, we consider further the influence of the staggered magnetic field $B \neq 0$. Such a field has a great impact on chain properties, e.g., in the quantum case this would lead to a spin gap in the excitation spectrum. As evident from Fig. 3 $B \neq 0$ has an to some extent analogous effect also in the classical chain, in particular $\chi_s(T \rightarrow 0) \rightarrow 0$ as well well as $C_V(T \rightarrow 0) \rightarrow 2$ for $B \neq 0$. But the most dramatic effect is on the transport properties. In Fig. 5 we present results for $l_{s,t}(T)$ obtained for $B = 0 - 0.5$ at fixed disorder $\delta J = 0.4$. It is evident that $B > 0$ enhances the localization crossover temperature T^* to values $T^* \propto B$. Moreover, the values of $l_{s,t}$ are strongly reduced at low $T < T^*$ even at modest δJ and small $B = 0.1$ where the maximum at $T = T^*$ hardly goes beyond the 'minimum metallic one', i.e. $l_{s,t} > 1$. In $B > 0.1$ the transport MFP are clearly below the naive localization criterion at any $T > 0$. The origin of the localization regime enhanced by $B > 0$ is not hard to rationalize, since the introduction of $B \neq 0$ extends the validity of the linear approximation to Eqs. (2) to much higher $T \propto B$ and consequently also to the enhanced manifestation of the Anderson localization.




Figure 5. (Color online) Transport mean free paths vs. T : a) spin diffusion $l_s(T)$, b) thermal $l_t(T)$, and c) the ratio $W = l_t/l_s$ for different staggered fields $B = 0 - 0.5$ and fixed disorder $\delta J = 0.4$

In connection to results in Figs. 4,5 it is also interesting to comment on the relation between both MFP: $l_s(T)$ and

$l_t(T)$. Well known Wiedemann-Franz law²⁹, mostly valid for transport in metals, translated to our system would require an equality of both MFP $l_t \sim l_s$ in the low (i.e. $T < J$) regime. Indeed we find that in the whole range of T presented in Fig. 5 the ratio $W = l_t/l_s$ ranges $0.5 < W < 2$ in the whole presented T regime, and this in spite of wide range of actual values of $10^{-2} < l_{s,t} < 10$. This implies that the concept of constant W makes sense not just at modest scattering but even in the quasi-localized (nearly-localized) regime.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, presented numerical results for the spin and thermal transport in classical disordered spin chain reveal some similarities as well as differences to the transport in quantum spin chains. First of all, numerical studies for classical spin models can be performed for large systems reaching reliable results for transport quantities even for low $T \ll J$ and arbitrary disorder which remains a severe challenge for quantum $S = 1/2$ models¹⁶, even more for larger $1/2 < S < \infty$.

In the pure case $\delta J = 0$ the $S = 1/2$ model is specific due to the integrability and consequently the ballistic transport⁴. Hence only the disorder can serve as the scattering mechanism^{16,17}. On the other hand, in the classical model without disorder $\delta J = 0$ the mean-free paths remain finite for any $T > 0$, with diverging $L_t, l_s \rightarrow \infty$ for $T \rightarrow 0$, and in this sense qualitatively approaching the dissipationless transport in pure $S = 1/2$ models^{6,7}. Still it should be reminded that there are qualitative difference between $S = 1/2$ and classical

spin model at $T \rightarrow 0$ in static quantities, in particular in the specific heat $C_V(T)$.

The most interesting common aspect of 1D classical and quantum spin $S = 1/2$ transport is the onset of localization due to disorder $\delta J > 0$ in both models at $T \rightarrow 0$. It is evident from our results, that there exists for any $\delta J > 0$ a characteristic T^* , where for $T < T^*$ transport MFP l_t, l_s decrease and eventually vanish with $T \rightarrow 0$, which can be understood with the dominant role of the linearized equations of motion, Eqs (2), and the Anderson localization of the eigen-solution. On the other hand, for $T > T^*$ the transport is already dominated by nonlinearity effects. Our study shows that within a classical model there is no abrupt transition between both regimes but rather a crossover at $T \sim T^*$ where mean-free paths $l_{s,t}$ are both maximum. It is remarkable that in a isotropic model the crossover, which indicates the onset of nonlinear excitations, appears already at very low $T^* \ll J$. Such a low- T regime could be hardly reached in numerical analysis of quantum models. On the other hand, our results confirm the finding in the quantum $S = 1/2$ case that the introduction of local fields B_i , both staggered as well as the random ones, can induce even stronger effect on the transport properties^{16,17}. This brings our model and results closer to the presumable many-body localization¹³⁻¹⁵ but still as an approximate description.

It should be also noted that our results at lower $T < J$ agree with the qualitative validity of the Wiedemann-Franz law, i.e. equality of MFP $l_t \sim l_s$, recovered even in nearly localised regime $l_{s,t} \ll 1$.

This work has been supported by the Programs P1-0044 and P1-0112 of the Slovenian Research Agency (ARRS).

-
- ¹ H. Bethe, Z. Physik **71**, 205 (1931).
² A. V. Sologubenko, K. Gianno, H. R. Ott, U. Ammerahl, and A. Revcolevschi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 2714 (2000).
³ N. Hlubek et al, J. Stat. Mech. **3**, 3006 (2012).
⁴ for a theoretical review see, e.g., X. Zotos and P. Prelovšek, in *Strong Interactions in Low Dimensions* (Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht), p.347 (2004).
⁵ X. Zotos, F. Naef, and P. Prelovšek, Phys. Rev. B **55**, 11029 (1997).
⁶ A. Klümper and K. Sakai, J. Phys. A **35**, 2173 (2002).
⁷ X. Zotos, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 1964 (1999).
⁸ C. A. Doty and D. S. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B **45**, 2167 (1992).
⁹ P. Schmitteckert, T. Schulze, C. Schuster, P. Schwab, and U. Eckern, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 560 (1998).
¹⁰ P. Anderson, Phys. Rev. **109**, 1492 (1958).
¹¹ P. Dean, Proc. Phys. Soc. **84**, 727 (1964).
¹² for a review see B. Kramer and A. MacKinnon, Rep. Prog. Phys. **56**, 1469 (1993).
¹³ D. M. Basko, I. L. Aleiner, and B. L. Altshuler, Ann. Phys. **321**, 1126 (2006).
¹⁴ V. Oganesyan and D. A. Huse, Phys. Rev. B **75**, 155111 (2007).
¹⁵ J. H. Bardarson, F. Pollmann, and J. E. Moore, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 017202 (2012).
¹⁶ A. Karahalios, A. Metavitsiadis, X. Zotos, A. Gorczyca, and P. Prelovšek, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 024425 (2009).
¹⁷ O. S. Barišić and P. Prelovšek, Phys. Rev. B **82**, 161106(R) (2010).
¹⁸ I. Tsukada, et al. Phys. Rev. B **60**, 6601 (1999).
¹⁹ M. Thede et al. Phys. Rev. B **86**, 180407 (2012).
²⁰ A. Mohan et al, Phys. Rev. B **89**, 104302 (2014).
²¹ S.-k. Ma, C. Dasgupta, and C.-k. Hu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **43**, 1434 (1979).
²² D. S. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B **50**, 3799 (1994).
²³ J. Herbrych, J. Kokalj and P. Prelovšek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 147203 (2013).
²⁴ J. Kokalj, J. Herbrych, A. Zheludev, and P. Prelovšek, Phys. Rev. B **91** 155147 (2015).
²⁵ A. V. Savin, G. P. Tsironis, and X. Zotos, Phys. Rev. B **72**, 140402 (2005).
²⁶ J. Karadamoglou and X. Zotos, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 177203 (2004).
²⁷ V. Oganesyan, A. Pal, and D. A. Huse, Phys. Rev. B **80**, 115104 (2009).
²⁸ A. Dhar and J. L. Lebowitz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 134301 (2008).
²⁹ N. W. Ashcroft and N. D. Wagner, *Solid State Physics*, (Holt - Saunders Int. Ed., New York, 1976).
³⁰ R. Kubo, M. Toda and N. Hashitume, *Statistical Physics*, Springer Series in Solid- State Science Vol. 2 Springer-Verlag, Berlin, (1991).
³¹ J. L. Garcia-Palacios and F. J. Lazaro, Phys. Rev. B **58**, 14937

- (1998).
- ³² D. Forster, *Hydrodynamic Fluctuations, Broken Symmetry, and Correlation functions*, (Frontier of Physics, ed. D. Pines) (1975).
- ³³ D. L. Huber, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **39**, 1170 (1968).
- ³⁴ D. L. Huber, J. S. Semura, and C. G. Windsor, *Phys. Rev.* **186**, 534 (1969).