Transport Properties of the Sommerfeld Model

We have seen that we must use quantum Femi-Dirac statistics to describe the thermodynamic behavior of conduction electrons.

What about the equation motion? Semiclassical arguments can be made to show that in many cases it remains OK to use the classical Drude equation of motion. We need to be able to construct electron wave packets which are localized on the desired spatial length scales.

We see that the typical electron energy is set by the Fermi energy $E_F$. Hence the typical momentum is $p \approx p_F$. If we make a wave packet with $\Delta p \ll p_F$ then spread in spatial position is

$$\Delta x \sim \frac{\hbar}{\Delta p} \gg \frac{1}{p_F} = \frac{1}{k_F}$$

So the electron cannot be localized to atomic length scales, but can be localized on the length scales of macroscopically varying electric, magnetic fields of temperature gradients $\sim 1000 K$, so $2K$ for motion in EM waves in visible spectrum
but not for X-rays ($\lambda_{\text{X-ray}} \approx 10^{-14}$).

We also need $\Delta x \ll l$ the mean free path. Classical motion may fail when $l \approx 10^{-8}$.

$$l = \frac{V}{c} \quad \text{where} \quad \frac{\tau}{T} \sim 10^{-14} \quad \text{and} \quad V \sim V_F \sim 10^8 \text{ cm/sec}$$

So $l \sim 10^8 \cdot 10^{-14} \text{ cm} = 10^{-6} \text{ cm} = 0.01 \text{ m}$

So looks ok.

Using Drude and Einstein motion + Fermi-Dirac statistics we then have

1. dc and ac electric conductivity same as for classical Drude model, since no thermo was involved

2. For thermal conductivity we had

$$K = \frac{1}{3} V^2 C_v$$

Now we should use $V \sim V_F$, $V_F^2 = \frac{2eF}{m}$

and $C_v = \frac{\pi^2}{3} \left( \frac{k_B}{e_F} \right) m k_B$.

$$\Rightarrow K = \frac{1}{3} \frac{2eF}{m} \frac{\pi^2}{3} \left( \frac{k_B}{e_F} \right) m k_B T$$

$$= \frac{\pi^2}{3m} \frac{2eF}{m} m k_B T$$
and Wiedemann–Franz coefficient is

\[ \frac{K}{\sigma T} = \frac{\pi^2}{3m} \tau m k_B^2 = \frac{\pi^2}{3} \left( \frac{k_B}{e} \right)^2 = 2.44 \times 10^{-8} \text{ watt m}^{-2} \text{ K}^{-2} \]

excellent agreement with experiment

(3) Thermopower

\[ \alpha = \frac{-e \sigma}{3m e} = \frac{-\pi^2}{6} \frac{k_B}{e} \left( \frac{k_B T}{e F} \right) \]

\[ = -1.42 \frac{(k_B T)}{e F} \times 10^{-4} \text{ volt} \text{ K}^{-1} \]

more reasonable result than classical value
Magnetic properties of Free Electron Gas

In the presence of an applied magnetic field $\vec{H}$, the electron gas will develop a net magnetization via two effects:

1) the intrinsic spins of the electrons
   - anti-align with $\vec{H} \Rightarrow$ magnetic moments
   - align with $\vec{H} \Rightarrow$ paramagnetic effect

   Pauli Paramagnetism

2) the electrons move in closed orbits
   - circulating currents $\Rightarrow$ magnetic moments anti-aligned with $\vec{H} \Rightarrow$
   - diamagnetic effect

   Landau diamagnetism

We consider just Pauli Paramagnetism

(CA&M Chpt 31)

An electron with intrinsic spin $\hat{s}$ (s_z = ±1) also intrinsic magnetic moment $\vec{\mu} = -\mu_0 \hat{s}$

where $\mu_0 = \frac{e\hbar}{2mc}$ is the Bohr magneton

The interaction energy of the spin with the applied magnetic field $\vec{H}$ is

$$\mathcal{E}_H = -\vec{\mu} \cdot \vec{H} = \mu_0 \hat{s} \cdot \vec{H}$$
state, as the energy will be lowered by
having up electrons at $\varepsilon_F + \mu H$, $s = +1$
convert into down electrons and go into
the empty states at $\varepsilon_F - \mu H$, $s = -1$.

The ground state will instead look like

\[ \text{down} \quad \text{up} \]
\[ \text{shaded areas are filled} \]
\[ \text{electron states} \]

\[ (k, s = -1) \quad (k, s = +1) \]

and we thus see that there will be more
down than up electrons in the ground state.
Since $s = -1$ electrons have magnetic moment
$-\mu_0 s$, the system has a net positive
magnetization $M$ aligned with $H$.

To see how big $M$ we need to compute
the number of up electrons that flip into
down electrons when $H$ is turned on.

We will assume that $H$ is small enough
that $\mu_0 H \ll \varepsilon_F$. When this is so, we
can ignore the fact that the density of
states has a slight variation with
energy $\varepsilon$ over the range $\varepsilon_F + \mu_0 H$ to $\varepsilon_F - \mu_0 H$
and assume it to be roughly constant $g(\varepsilon_F)$. 
The number of up electrons that flip is then easily computed from the following sketch:

\[ E_p - \mu_0 H \quad \text{down} \]

\[ E_p + \mu_0 H \quad \text{up} \]

The number of up electrons that must flip is therefore

\[ g_+ (E_F) \Delta E \]

where \( g_+ (E_F) = \frac{1}{2} g (E_F) \) is the density of states of up electrons at \( E_F \), which is the total density of states at \( E_F \), and \( \Delta E = \frac{1}{2} [\mu_{\text{tot}} - (-\mu_{\text{tot}})] = \mu_{\text{tot}} \) is the energy interval that must flip. The number that flip is therefore

\[ \Delta m = \frac{1}{2} g (E_F) \mu_{\text{tot}}. \]

In the new ground state, the number of down electrons is now \( m_0 + \Delta m \), and the number of up electrons is \( m_0 - \Delta m \), where \( m_0 = \frac{1}{2} m \) is the total number when \( H = 0 \).
5. The net magnetization is now \((at \, T=0)\)

\[
M = \mu_0 (m_- - m_+) \\
= \mu_0 (m_0 + \Delta m - (m_0 - \Delta m)) \\
= 2\mu_0 \Delta m \\
= g(E_F) \mu_0^2 H
\]

and the Pauli paramagnetic susceptibility is

\[
\chi_p = \frac{\partial M}{\partial H} = g(E_F) \mu_0^2
\]

proportional to the density of states at Fermi energy.

For the free electron gas, we have

\[
g(E_F) = \frac{3}{2} \frac{m}{E_F}
\]

\[
\chi_p = \frac{3}{2} \frac{m}{E_F} \mu_0^2
\]

\[
m \sim k_F^3 \quad E_F \sim k_F^2 \quad \text{so} \quad \chi_p \sim k_F \sim \frac{1}{(r_s/a_0)}
\]

\[
\chi_p = \frac{2.59 \times 10^{-6}}{(r_s/a_0)}
\]

Corrections to above result at finite \(T\) of order \((T/T_F)^2\) so above is very good at all \(T < T_F\) and so good at room temperature.
Compare to experiment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>$\alpha/ae$</th>
<th>$x_p$</th>
<th>$x_p^{\text{theory}}$</th>
<th>$x_p^{\text{ext}} \times 10^{-6}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Li</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rb</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cs</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It turns out that the discrepancy between theory and experiment is mainly due to heavy neglected electron-electron interactions.

Note that $x_p$ above is very different from what one gets with classical statistics.

Classically

$$M \sim \left[ (t_1) e^{-\mu_0 H/k_B T} + (t_1) e^{\mu_0 H/k_B T} \right] (-\mu_0) m$$

$$= \left[ e^{\mu_0 H/k_B T} - e^{-\mu_0 H/k_B T} \right] \frac{m}{e^{\mu_0 H/k_B T} + e^{-\mu_0 H/k_B T}}$$

$$\sim \frac{\mu_0 H m}{k_B T} \text{ when } \mu_0 H \ll k_B T$$

$$x_{p,\text{classical}} = \frac{dM}{dH} \sim \frac{\mu_0 m}{k_B T} \text{ Curie law } \sim \frac{1}{T}$$

So

$$\frac{x_p}{x_{p,\text{classical}}} \sim \left( \frac{T}{T_F} \right) \ll 1$$