

## Average Persistent Current in a Mesoscopic Ring

Felix von Oppen and Eberhard K. Riedel

*Department of Physics, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98195*

(Received 23 August 1990)

We present a microscopic calculation of the disorder-averaged persistent current for a mesoscopic ring with a fixed number of electrons. Using an idea by Imry, we show that the even Fourier components of the average current dominate and are related to the typical single-level current  $\langle I_{2p} \rangle_D \propto \langle i_p^2 \rangle_D / I_0$ , which can be calculated by a Green's-function-averaging technique. For the small even harmonics  $p$ , the result simplifies to  $\langle I_{2p} \rangle_D \approx I_0 / 2\pi M$ , where  $M$  is the number of transverse channels. Its relevance to multiring experiments is discussed.

PACS numbers: 72.10.Bg, 05.30.Ch, 73.50.Bk, 73.60.Aq

Quantum persistent currents<sup>1</sup> in small nonsuperconducting rings threaded by a magnetic flux  $\varphi$  have aroused excitement and controversy during the past year.<sup>2-8</sup> In particular, the disorder average of the current and its harmonic content,  $\langle I \rangle_D = \sum_p \langle I_p \rangle_D \sin(2\pi p\varphi)$ , are intriguing theorists.<sup>6-9</sup> One reason is the averaging controversy concerning the differences between averaging at a constant number of electrons  $N$  versus constant chemical potential  $\mu$ . The other reason is that the first persistent-current experiment was performed on an ensemble of  $10^7$  disconnected rings,<sup>4</sup> so that a comparison with theory requires one to compute the ensemble-averaged current per ring, which is different in magnitude and periodicity as function of flux from that of the typical current<sup>2</sup> in a single-ring experiment. The average current contains single-electron and collective contributions, the latter<sup>5</sup> due to the electron-electron interaction. Their relative size depends on the number of effective channels  $M_{\text{eff}}$ .<sup>7</sup> Although the form of the single-electron contribution had been conjectured from computer simulations<sup>6</sup> and by a correspondence argument,<sup>7</sup> it resisted analytical calculation because of the averaging problems involved. Here we present a Green's-function approach to this quantity and determine its form and amplitude in the diffusive regime. The results differ from the numerical ones.<sup>6</sup> Our main formulas are given in Eqs. (3), (4), and (8).

Three observations led gradually to a deeper understanding of the problem and the present calculation.

(i) Calculations for one-channel loops<sup>10</sup> and numerical studies for multichannel rings<sup>3</sup> indicated that while computing fluctuations  $\langle I^2 \rangle_D$  is insensitive to averaging at constant  $N$  versus constant  $\mu$ ,<sup>2</sup> the average currents are different,  $\langle I(N) \rangle_D \neq \langle I(\mu) \rangle_D$ . Specifically, the numerical studies employing averaging over  $N$  indicated period halving also for ensembles of multichannel rings, i.e.,  $\langle I_{p=1}(N) \rangle_{N,D} = 0$  while  $\langle I_{p=2}(N) \rangle_{N,D} > 0$ .<sup>3</sup> This can be understood from the structure of the energy spectrum of rings.

(ii) Bouchiat and Montambaux<sup>3</sup> found that in the ballistic regime  $\langle I_{p=2} \rangle_{N,D} = I_0$  is independent of the number of channels. Based on extensive numerical cal-

culations<sup>6</sup> and a correspondence argument<sup>7</sup> (relating the ballistic and diffusive regimes) it was conjectured that in the diffusive regime the amplitude is related to the typical single-level current<sup>2</sup> and  $\langle I_{p=2} \rangle_{N,D} = C(I_{\text{el}}/ML)^{1/2} I_0$ , which showed that both averages,  $\langle I^2 \rangle_D$  and  $\langle I \rangle_D$ , may not depend sensitively on filling.

(iii) Imry<sup>8</sup> observed that expanding the thermodynamic potential  $\Omega$  in terms of  $\delta\mu = \mu(\varphi) - \epsilon_F$  by imposing the constant- $N$  condition allows one to isolate a term  $\Delta\Omega = \frac{1}{2} \rho(\epsilon_F)(\delta\mu)^2$  that can account for period halving. A corresponding formula is derived below without expansion.

The system is a thin-walled normal-metal ring (e.g., Cu or Au) threaded by a magnetic flux  $\varphi = \phi/\phi_0$ , with  $\phi_0 = hc/e$ . The flux is treated as an external parameter. The quantum persistent current is an equilibrium property and defined in terms of the thermodynamic potential  $\Omega$  of the system,<sup>11</sup>

$$I = - \frac{e}{h} \frac{\partial \Omega}{\partial \varphi}. \quad (1)$$

A useful unit for the current is  $I_0 = ev_F/L$ . We denote the number of electrons in the ring by  $N$ ; for constant  $N$  the chemical potential is flux dependent,  $\mu = \mu(\varphi)$ . Before averaging, the current  $I$  of a single ring is strongly sample specific, changing sign as a function of filling, with an average period  $M_{\text{eff}}$ ,<sup>2</sup> and randomly with disorder configurations.

We use the following notation. At zero temperature, the characteristic length scales are the ring circumference  $L$ , elastic mean free path  $l_{\text{el}}$ , and localization length  $\xi \propto Ml_{\text{el}}$ . In the diffusive regime one has  $l_{\text{el}} < L < \xi$ . We assume that the electronic phase coherence length exceeds  $L$ . A ring with a cross-sectional area  $A$  has  $M = Ak_F/4\pi$  transverse channels. There are two relevant energy scales,<sup>2</sup> the level spacing or inverse density of states  $\Delta_M = 1/\rho(\epsilon_F)$ , and the correlation or Thouless energy  $E_c = \pi^2 \hbar D/L^2 \propto \hbar/\tau_D$ , where  $\tau_D = L^2/D$  is the time for diffusion around the ring ( $D = v_F l_{\text{el}}/d$ ). The latter can be expressed as  $E_c \propto \Delta_M M_{\text{eff}}$  in terms of the effective number of channels  $M_{\text{eff}} = Ml_{\text{el}}/L$ .

We now present the details of our calculation. It

proceeds in two steps, the first leading to Eq. (4) and the second being the microscopic calculation of  $\langle i_p^2 \rangle_D$  resulting in Eqs. (6) and (7). The electron-electron interaction is not included.

At zero temperature and constant filling  $N$  the persistent current is given by  $I(N) = -(e/h)(\partial E/\partial \varphi)_N$ , in terms of the total energy of the system  $E = \int_0^\mu d\omega \omega \rho(\omega)$ , with the side condition  $N = \int_0^\mu d\omega \rho(\omega) = \text{const}$ . Since the chemical potential  $\mu$  and the density of states  $\rho(\omega)$  are periodic functions of the flux  $\varphi$  through the ring,

$$\mu = \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} \mu_p \cos(2\pi p \varphi),$$

$$\rho(\omega) = \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} \rho_p(\omega) \cos(2\pi p \varphi).$$

While  $\rho_{p=0}(\omega)$  is a slowly varying function of  $\omega$ , the higher harmonics change sign with an average period  $E_c$ . The variation of  $\mu(\varphi)$  with disorder is also of magnitude  $E_c$ .

We introduce a parameter  $\bar{\mu}$  to isolate the large flux-independent contribution to the chemical potential  $\mu$ . Later we choose  $\bar{\mu} \equiv \langle \mu_{p=0} \rangle_D$ . Differentiating  $E$ ,

$$\partial E/\partial \varphi = \mu \rho(\mu) \partial \mu/\partial \varphi + \int_0^\mu d\omega \omega [\partial \rho(\omega)/\partial \varphi],$$

and using the side condition  $dN/d\varphi = 0$ , we obtain the following *exact* expression for the current:

$$I = -\frac{e}{h} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \rho(\mu) \frac{\partial}{\partial \varphi} (\mu - \bar{\mu})^2 + \int_{\bar{\mu}}^\mu d\omega (\omega - \bar{\mu}) \frac{\partial}{\partial \varphi} \rho(\omega) + \int_0^{\bar{\mu}} d\omega (\omega - \bar{\mu}) \frac{\partial}{\partial \varphi} \rho(\omega) \right], \quad (2)$$

where  $\mu = \mu(\varphi)$  and  $\bar{\mu}$  is constant. Note that  $\partial I/\partial \bar{\mu} = 0$  is equivalent to  $dN/d\varphi = 0$ . We perform the disorder average on Eq. (2). The last term is  $\langle I(\bar{\mu}) \rangle_D$ , which has been shown to be exponentially small.<sup>2</sup> The second term contains nonzero correlations but contributes only to higher order,  $E_c/\bar{\mu}$ . The average of the first term can be factorized up to corrections of the same order. The proof uses the periodicity of  $\rho_{p \geq 1}(\omega)$  and factorization of disorder averages. It is subtle since there are many terms of comparable order. First, differentiate  $dN/d\varphi = 0$  with respect to  $\mu$ , which yields the condition

$$\langle \rho_{p \geq 1}(\bar{\mu}) \mu_{p \geq 1} \rangle_D \propto \langle \rho'_{p=0}(\bar{\mu}) \rangle_D \langle \mu_{p \geq 1}^2 \rangle_D.$$

Then, note that the second term in (2) contributes terms

$$\begin{aligned} \langle i^2 \rangle_D = I_0^2 2 \text{Re} \int_{\bar{\mu}-\Delta_M}^{\bar{\mu}} \frac{dE}{2\pi} \int_{\bar{\mu}-\Delta_M}^{\bar{\mu}} \frac{dE'}{2\pi} \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}'} \frac{k_x k'_x}{k_f^2} \langle G^+(\mathbf{k}, E) \rangle_D^2 \langle G^-(\mathbf{k}', E') \rangle_D^2 \\ \times \left[ D(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}', E - E') + \sum_{\mathbf{p}} \langle G^+(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{p}, E) \rangle_D \langle G^-(\mathbf{k}' + \mathbf{p}, E') \rangle_D D^2(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}' - \mathbf{p}, E - E') \right. \\ \left. + K(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}', E - E') + \sum_{\mathbf{p}} \langle G^+(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{p}, E) \rangle_D \langle G^-(\mathbf{k}' - \mathbf{p}, E') \rangle_D K^2(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}' - \mathbf{p}, E - E') \right]. \quad (5) \end{aligned}$$

$\langle [\partial \rho^{(n)}/\partial \varphi] (\mu - \bar{\mu})^{n+2} \rangle_D$ , where  $n \geq 1$ , which have the harmonic amplitudes  $\langle \rho_{p \geq 1}(\bar{\mu}) \mu_{p \geq 1} \rangle_D E_c$ . Applying the above condition then implies that their size relative to the first term is of order  $\langle \rho'_{p=0}(\bar{\mu}) \rangle_D E_c / \langle \rho_{p=0}(\bar{\mu}) \rangle_D \propto E_c/\bar{\mu}$ . Hence, the disorder-averaged current is

$$\langle I(N) \rangle_D = -\frac{e}{2h} \langle \rho(\bar{\mu}) \rangle_D \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial \varphi} (\mu - \bar{\mu})^2 \right\rangle_D \times \left[ 1 + O\left(\frac{E_c}{\bar{\mu}}\right) \right]. \quad (3)$$

The derivation is easily generalized to finite temperature and leads then to (3) with a  $\mu(\varphi, T)$ . One can express the leading contribution to the average current also as

$$\langle I(N) \rangle_D = \langle \rho(\bar{\mu}) \rangle_D \langle (\partial \delta F/\partial N) (\partial I/\partial N) \rangle_D,$$

in terms of the changes of the free energy and the total current with  $N$  at constant flux ( $\delta F = F - \langle F \rangle_D$ ).

Next, we use Eq. (3) to calculate the single-electron contribution to the average current  $\langle I(N) \rangle_D$ . We replace the chemical potential and its flux derivative by a single-level energy  $E_n$  and current  $i_n = -(e/h) \partial E_n/\partial \varphi$ , say, of a level within  $E_c$  of the Fermi surface. This is a reasonable assumption because of level repulsion and the strong (anti)correlations in the spectrum of closed rings. Relating the Fourier amplitudes of the level energies to those of the level current,  $i = \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} i_p \sin(2\pi p \varphi)$ , and assuming the absence of correlations between different harmonics (which is confirmed by the microscopic calculation), one concludes

$$\langle I_{2p} \rangle_D = (M/\pi p I_0) \langle i_p^2 \rangle_D \quad (4)$$

for the even harmonics.<sup>12</sup> The odd harmonics have exponentially small amplitudes. This remarkable relationship was first conjectured for  $p=1$  in Montambaux *et al.*<sup>6</sup> from numerical work (however, see discussion of numerical results below) and derived in Ref. 3 for the strongly localized regime.

The square of the single-level current is insensitive to averaging at constant  $N$  or  $\mu$ , and we use the Green's-function approach<sup>2</sup> for its calculation. Starting from the standard formula

$$I = I_0 \int \frac{dE}{2\pi i} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{k_x}{k_f} [G^+(k, E) - G^-(k, E)],$$

we obtain, after squaring and disorder averaging, to leading order

Here  $D$  and  $K$  denote the diffusion and Cooperon contributions. Equation (5) with the limits of integration extending from  $-\infty$  to  $\bar{\mu}$  can be used to calculate the typical total current  $\langle I^2 \rangle_D^{1/2}$ . The second-order terms in  $D$  and  $K$  were not considered in Ref. 2.<sup>13</sup>

To obtain the typical single-level current, we integrate over an energy interval that contains on average one energy level near the Fermi surface. While this procedure would be unjustified for a particular impurity configuration, it is valid after impurity averaging due to the equivalence of averaging across the across the spec-

trum and over all impurity configurations. The summation over the flux-dependent longitudinal components of the momentum vectors is best performed by using the Poisson summation formula. After shifting the momentum variables in the second-order term, the sum over  $\mathbf{p}$  involves only Green's functions and its flux-independent part gives the dominant contribution. For rings of circumference much larger than the transverse dimensions ( $L \gg L_\perp$ ) only the  $k_\perp = k'_\perp$  terms contribute to leading order. Performing these summations and energy integrals yields

$$\langle i^2 \rangle_D = I_0^2 \left( \frac{4 l_{el}}{\pi d L} \right)^2 \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{p^3} \sin^2(2\pi p \varphi) \left\{ 3 - u \frac{\partial}{\partial u} \right\} \{ 1 - e^{-u} [(1+u)\cos u + u \sin u] \}, \quad (6)$$

with  $u = \frac{1}{2} p (\pi d / M_{\text{eff}})^{1/2}$ . The Fourier coefficients  $\langle i_p^2 \rangle_D$  in Eq. (6) exhibit different  $p$  dependence for  $p \lesssim M_{\text{eff}}^{1/2}$ . When  $p \ll M_{\text{eff}}^{1/2}$ , one may expand in  $u$  and find, to fifth order in  $u$ ,

$$\langle i_p^2 \rangle_D = \left( \frac{I_0}{M} \right)^2 \left\{ \frac{1}{2} p - \frac{2}{15} p^2 \left( \frac{\pi d}{M_{\text{eff}}} \right)^{1/2} + \dots \right\}. \quad (7)$$

Here the leading term is independent of disorder. Performing the sum over  $p$  in Eq. (6) yields for the typical single-level current  $\langle i^2 \rangle_D^{1/2} = I_0 (l_{el} / 2dML)^{1/2}$  independent of flux, when  $|\varphi| \gtrsim M_{\text{eff}}^{-1/2}$ .

By combining these results with Eq. (4), we obtain for the even Fourier coefficients (with  $p \ll M_{\text{eff}}^{1/2}$ ) of the disorder-averaged current in the diffusive regime

$$\langle I_{2p} \rangle_D = \frac{I_0}{M} \left\{ \frac{1}{2\pi} - \frac{2p}{15\pi} \left( \frac{\pi d}{M_{\text{eff}}} \right)^{1/2} + \dots \right\}. \quad (8)$$

Note that the sample-specific dependence of the current on filling  $N$  has dropped out by averaging.

The amplitude in (8) can be expressed in terms of the diffusion time  $\tau_D$  around the ring,  $I_0/M = d(e/\tau_D)M_{\text{eff}}^{-1}$ , which shows that the harmonics of the disorder-averaged current are smaller by a factor of  $1/M_{\text{eff}}$  than the typical current  $\langle I_{p=1}^2 \rangle_D^{1/2}$  for the same ring.<sup>2</sup> For the ratio of the harmonics of the typical single-level and total currents we obtain  $\langle i_p^2 \rangle_D^{1/2} / \langle I_{p=1}^2 \rangle_D^{1/2} = \frac{1}{4} (p/3)^{1/2} (\pi d / M_{\text{eff}})$ , while the ratio of the typical currents at constant flux is  $\langle i^2 \rangle_D^{1/2} / \langle I^2 \rangle_D^{1/2} \propto (\pi d / M_{\text{eff}})^{1/2}$ . The result that  $\langle i^2 \rangle_D$  is constant as a function of flux, when  $|\varphi| \gtrsim M_{\text{eff}}^{-1/2}$ , agrees with numerical findings<sup>2,6</sup> and can be explained in terms of the structure of the energy spectrum.

The discrepancy between (8) and the formula  $\langle I_2 \rangle_D = C(I_0/M)M_{\text{eff}}^{1/2}$  (with  $C \approx 0.05$ ) inferred from computer simulations<sup>6</sup> comes as a surprise and a puzzle. The  $u^3$  term in Eq. (7) or (8) has precisely that functional dependence but its coefficient vanishes. It is not clear whether finite-size effects lead to a nonzero coefficient. One would obtain a nonvanishing coefficient if one modified the diffusion constant  $D = v_F l_{el} / d$ , e.g., by introducing an effective dimensionality<sup>14</sup>  $d^* \neq d$  in  $D$  but not elsewhere in the calculations, but we have not found a

microscopic justification for this. However, the analytical result  $\langle I_2 \rangle_D / I_0 \approx 1/2\pi M$  is not inconsistent with the numerical amplitudes in Fig. 3(c) of Ref. 6 for the largest  $M$ , i.e.,  $M = 64, 100$ . Recent simulations involving rings with larger transverse size  $L_\perp$  are better fitted by (8).<sup>15</sup>

The leading term in Eq. (8),  $\langle I_{2p} \rangle_D \approx I_0 / 2\pi M$ , was independently obtained by Schmid<sup>16</sup> and Altshuler, Gefen, and Imry<sup>17</sup> from a formula that relates the ensemble-averaged current to the grand-canonical fluctuation of the number of particles with flux,

$$\langle I(N) \rangle_D = - (e/2h) \langle \rho(\bar{\mu}) \rangle_D^{-1} \partial \langle (\delta N)^2 \rangle_D / \partial \varphi.$$

From this they may also determine the temperature corrections, which are similar to those for the collective contribution to the persistent current.<sup>5</sup> However, their calculation can only produce the first term in (8), which explains, e.g., the pathological flux dependence  $\langle I \rangle_D \propto I_0 \cot(\pi\varphi)$ .<sup>16</sup> This difficulty is presumably related to the expansion of the  $N = \text{const}$  condition to first order in  $\delta\mu(\varphi)$ ,  $\langle \rho(\bar{\mu}) \rangle_D \delta\mu(\varphi) \approx - \int \delta \bar{\omega} \delta \rho(\varphi, \omega)$ ,<sup>18</sup> which is problematic since the discreteness of the energy spectrum leads to different flux dependences on the left- and right-hand sides of this equation. By avoiding such an expansion our approach yields the full harmonic content of the average current.

Equation (8) with  $d=3$  applies to multiring experiments.<sup>4</sup> The additional ensemble average over  $N$  is trivial since the result for the average current (in units of  $I_0$ ) does not depend on filling. Our formula implies that at zero temperature the ratio of the single-electron and collective<sup>5,7</sup> (due to the electron-electron interaction) contributions to the persistent current is  $\langle I_{p=2}^{(s)} \rangle_D / \langle I_{p=2}^{(c)} \rangle_D = (3/4\tilde{\lambda}) M_{\text{eff}}^{-1} \approx 7 M_{\text{eff}}^{-1}$  for Cu or Au rings ( $\tilde{\lambda} \approx 0.1$ ) which indicates that the collective contribution dominates in systems with large  $M_{\text{eff}}$ .<sup>5,7</sup> This estimate uses the effective coupling constant  $\tilde{\lambda} = \lambda / [1 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda \ln(\bar{\mu}/E_c)] \approx \lambda/5$ , due to higher-order diagrams,<sup>19</sup> rather than  $\lambda$  as in Ref. 5. Taking parameters appropriate for the experiment by Lévy *et al.*<sup>4</sup> ( $L \approx 2.2 \mu\text{m}$ ,  $M \approx 17000$ , and  $l_{el} \approx 0.02 \mu\text{m}$ ), one predicts for the collective contribu-

tion  $\langle I_{p=2}^{(c)} \rangle_D = (4l_{cl}/\pi dL)\tilde{\lambda}I_0 \approx 0.05$  nA and for the single-particle contribution  $\langle I_{p=2}^{(s)} \rangle_D = I_0/2\pi M \approx 1$  pA, in contrast to the experimental result of  $\approx -0.4$  nA. It has been mentioned<sup>4</sup> that spin-orbit scattering may change the sign of the single-electron contribution. The present calculation shows that this is not the case, cf. Eq. (4), only the amplitude is reduced.

In summary, we have presented a microscopic calculation of the ensemble-averaged persistent current in multichannel rings in the diffusive regime. The difficulties of performing disorder averages at a constant number of electrons  $N$  have been circumvented by first relating the average total current to the fluctuations in the single-level current and then calculating the latter quantity using Green's functions in the standard way.

It is a pleasure to thank B. L. Altshuler and G. Montambaux for stimulating discussions and useful information and Y. Imry for correspondence. E.K.R. acknowledges the hospitality of the Aspen Center of Physics, where part of this work was performed. This research was supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. DMR-88-13083.

<sup>1</sup>M. Büttiker, Y. Imry, and R. Landauer, Phys. Lett. **96A**, 365 (1983).

<sup>2</sup>H. F. Cheung, E. K. Riedel, and Y. Gefen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 587 (1989); E. K. Riedel, H. F. Cheung, and Y. Gefen, Phys. Scr. **T25**, 357 (1989).

<sup>3</sup>H. Bouchiat and G. Montambaux, J. Phys. (Paris) **50**, 2695 (1989).

<sup>4</sup>L. P. Lévy, G. Dolan, J. Dunsmuir, and H. Bouchiat, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 2074 (1990).

<sup>5</sup>V. Ambegaokar and U. Eckern, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 381 (1990).

<sup>6</sup>G. Montambaux, H. Bouchiat, D. Sigeti, and R. Friesner, Phys. Rev. B **42**, 7647 (1990).

<sup>7</sup>E. K. Riedel, in "Quantum Coherence in Mesoscopic Systems," edited by B. Kramer (Plenum, New York, to be published).

<sup>8</sup>Y. Imry, in "Quantum Coherence in Mesoscopic Systems" (Ref. 7).

<sup>9</sup>B. L. Altshuler and collaborators and A. D. Stone also approached this problem (private communication).

<sup>10</sup>H. F. Cheung, Y. Gefen, E. K. Riedel, and W. H. Shih, Phys. Rev. B **37**, 6050 (1988).

<sup>11</sup>N. Byers and C. N. Yang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **7**, 46 (1961); F. Bloch, Phys. Rev. B **2**, 109 (1970).

<sup>12</sup>This relationship was also obtained by Y. Imry and G. Montambaux, see Ref. 6, *note added*.

<sup>13</sup>Including these contributions changes the numerical coefficient in the amplitude of the total typical current [Eq. (2) of Ref. 2] to  $(4/\pi d)\sqrt{6}$ , which for  $d=3$  yields 1.04 (including a factor of 2 for spin).

<sup>14</sup>A  $d^* \approx 1$  for quasi-one-dimensional diffusion ( $l_{cl} \gtrsim L_{\perp}$ ) has been mentioned; see, e.g., G. Bergmann, Phys. Rep. **107**, 1 (1984).

<sup>15</sup>G. Montambaux (private communication).

<sup>16</sup>A. Schmid, preceding Letter, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 80 (1991).

<sup>17</sup>B. L. Altshuler, Y. Gefen, and Y. Imry, following Letter, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 88 (1991).

<sup>18</sup>The work of A. Schmid [Ref. 16, Eqs. (4), (7), and (8)] makes it particularly clear that this approximation is the principal difference between the "thermodynamic parts" of the two calculations.

<sup>19</sup>B. L. Altshuler, D. E. Khmel'nitskii, and B. Z. Spivak, Solid State Commun. **48**, 841 (1983).