Reply to the Comment on “Negative Landau damping in bilayer graphene”
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In the preceding Comment [1] Svintsov and Ryzhii (SR) express two concerns about the calculation of the graphene polarizability in our Letter [2]. The first concern is that according to them the Doppler shift transformation \( \omega \rightarrow \tilde{\omega} = \omega - k_x v_0 \) cannot be applied to graphene because its energy dispersion is linear. The graphene conductivity derived by us using the self-consistent field approach is [2, 3]

\[
\sigma_{\text{drift}}(\omega, k_x) = (\omega / \tilde{\omega}) \sigma_g(\tilde{\omega}, k_x),
\]

(1)

where \( \sigma_g(\omega, k_x) \) is the nonlocal conductivity with no drift. The drift effect is approximately modeled by the interaction Hamiltonian \( \hat{H}_{\text{int,drift}} = v_0 \cdot \hat{p} \), which effectively shifts the electrons velocity by \( v_0 \) [2]. For simplicity, we neglect the drift velocity dependence on the electron energy. Equation (1) generalizes to graphene the well-known result \( \varepsilon_{\text{drift}}(\omega, k_x) = \varepsilon(\omega - k_x v_0, k_x) \), which gives the dielectric permittivity of a drift-biased plasma [4-6]. Note that for 3D materials one has \( \varepsilon(\omega) = 1 + \sigma / (-i\omega \varepsilon_0) \).

SR argue that \( \sigma_{\text{drift}}^{\text{g}} \) should instead be calculated with the Lindhard formula with a skewed non-equilibrium electron distribution because of the “absence of Galilean invariance”. We reject the idea that the linear energy dispersion of graphene invalidates our Eq. (1) because (i) our derivation in [2] takes into account the linear energy
dispersion, (ii) we show below that our formalism gives results qualitatively similar to those of Refs. [7, 8] in the region of negative Landau damping for moderately large $v_0$, (iii) for $v_0$ near $v_F$ the skewed Fermi surface is highly distorted and arguably is inapplicable; thus, the importance of relativistic-type corrections is unclear [9]. Furthermore, we show that the SR model leads to unphysical results. It is underscored that the SR model differs from earlier works [7, 8, 10] (see [9]).

The second concern of SR is that our calculations in [2] rely on a long-wavelength approximation, $\sigma_g(\omega,k_x) \approx \sigma_g(\omega,k_x=0)$, i.e., that we neglected the nonlocal corrections in the bare graphene response. We agree that in the collisionless regime discussed by SR the nonlocal effects are important. However, we underline that even in such a regime these effects neither preclude a “negative Landau damping” nor the emergence of instabilities in related graphene platforms. In fact, the square root singularity of $\sigma_g$ is compatible with gain regimes because when $\tilde{\omega} = \omega - k_x v_0$ is negative the pre-factor $\omega / \tilde{\omega}$ of (1) is also negative. Thereby, the negative Landau damping, $\text{Re}\{\sigma^{\text{drift}}_g(\omega,k_x)\} < 0$, can occur in the real-frequency axis (Fig. 1ai), or more generally in the upper-half frequency plane (UHP), $\omega'' = \text{Im}\{\omega\} \geq 0$ with $\omega = \omega' + i \omega''$. Note that a passive medium has $\text{Re}\{\sigma(\omega,k_x)\} \geq 0$ in the UHP for any real-valued $k_x$ [9, 11]. The same result is predicted by the collisionless Levitov’s and Polini’s models (see Fig. 1ai and [9]). A response with $\text{Re}\{\sigma^{\text{drift}}_g\} < 0$ may lead to power flows emerging from the graphene sheet [9]. Importantly, the SR model also predicts gain regimes with $\text{Re}\{\sigma^{\text{drift}}_g\} < 0$ in the UHP (see Fig. 1aii), but the strength of their negative conductivity ($\text{Re}\{\sigma^{\text{drift}}_g\}$) is unreasonably large and, surprisingly the gain $-\text{Re}\{\sigma^{\text{drift}}_g\}$ can be larger for smaller drift velocities.
Fig. 1. (a) Real part of the graphene conductivity in the UHP as a function of the normalized frequency $\hbar \omega / E_g$ for $k_x = 1.6 k_F$ and $E_g = 0.1$ eV. i) Our theory [Eq. (1)] (blue), Levitov’s theory [7] (green), Polini’s theory [8] (purple dashed), and SR theory [1] (orange dot-dashed), for $v_0 = 0.5 v_F$ and $\omega^* = 0^*$. The negative Landau damping region is shaded in gray. ii) conductivity of SR evaluated for $h \omega / E_g = 0.62$. (b) (Top) Sketch of a system formed by a drift-current biased graphene sheet ($E_g = 0.1$ eV) and a metal half-space with relative permittivity $\varepsilon_m(\omega) = 1 - \omega^2 / \omega^2$ separated by a dielectric gap with thickness $d$ and permittivity $\varepsilon_d = 4$. (Bottom) Real (dashed curves) and imaginary (solid curves) parts of $\omega / (2 \pi) = f' + if''$ for the unstable mode as a function of $k_x$, calculated using i) our Eq. (1) (blue) and Levitov’s model [7] (green) with $v_0 = 0.5 v_F$, $\omega_p / (2 \pi) = 37.5$ THz, and $d = 3$ nm; ii) with the theory of SR [1] for $\omega_p \to \infty$ (PEC limit); green: $v_0 = 0.92 v_F$ and $d = 3$ nm; blue: $v_0 = 0.92 v_F$ and $d = 1$ nm; purple: $v_0 = 0.5 v_F$ and $d = 3$ nm.

Similar to our proposal in [2], by coupling the drift-current biased graphene to a resonant system it may be possible to spontaneously generate IR radiation, even in the collisionless nonlocal regime. As an illustration, we consider a drift-current biased graphene sheet coupled to a metal half-space (Fig. 1b, top). Both our nonlocal model and the SR theory predict unstable regimes, i.e., solutions with $f'' = \omega^*/(2 \pi) > 0$ that grow exponentially with time. Evidently, the SR theory (Fig. 1bii) yields unreasonably strong instabilities (with growth rates often absurdly large, e.g., $f'' / f' > 10$; the growth
rate increases when \( d \) increases and when \( v_0 \) decreases, which is physically senseless), and hence, it has no predictive value. In contrast, our results are physically reasonable and consistent with the collisionless Levitov’s model [7] (Fig. 1b(i)). This instability is rooted in the optical pumping of a single resonance with the gain provided by the drifting electrons, rather than due to the hybridization of two plasmons. Thus, Fig. 1 of Ref. [1] is not relevant for this example.

In summary, in the collisionless regime the nonlocal effects are important but the square-root singularity of \( \sigma^{\text{drin}}_g \) does not forbid unstable modes in drift-current biased graphene platforms. We reject the criticism of SR about our Eq. (1), and we have shown that their model leads to unphysical results and contradicts earlier works. As acknowledged by SR, in the hydrodynamic regime, when the particle-particle collision rate is sufficiently large (e.g., at room temperature as in [2]) the nonlocal effects may be washed out [7] and instabilities qualitatively similar to those reported in [2] may emerge.
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A. Comparison between the different graphene conductivity models in the collisionless regime

Here we compare the nonlocal conductivity of the drift-current biased graphene in the collisionless regime calculated with our theory [R1] with results of other works [R2-R4].

In the Svintsov and Ryzhii (SR) theory the graphene conductivity for the waves propagating parallel to the drift current is given by (restoring explicitly all the units) [R2],

\[
\sigma_{g}^{SR}(\omega, k_x) = -ie^2 \frac{\omega}{k_x^2 \left(\hbar v_F^2\right)^2} \Pi(\omega, k_x), \quad (S1a)
\]

\[
\Pi(\omega, k_x) = \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{E_F}{\left(1 - s \beta\right)^2} \left(\sqrt{1 - \beta^2} - \frac{s + \beta}{\sqrt{s^2 - 1}}\right), \quad (S1b)
\]

with \( E_F \) the Fermi energy, \( s = \omega / |v_F k_x| \), \( \beta = v_0 / v_F \), and \( \omega \) in the upper-half frequency plane (UHP).

The conductivity obtained from Levitov’s collisionless theory is [R3]¹:

\[
\sigma_{g}^{\text{Levitov}}(\omega, k_x) = \frac{i e^2}{\hbar^2} \frac{2E_F}{\pi} \frac{1}{\gamma(\omega - v_0 k_x)\sqrt{\omega^2 - v_F^2 k_x^2 + \omega^2 - v_F^2 k_x^2}}. \quad (S2)
\]

for \( \omega \) in the UHP and \( \gamma = 1 / \sqrt{1 - v_0^2 / v_F^2} \).

The real-part of the conductivity obtained from Polini’s theory [R4] for the waves propagating parallel to the drift current at zero-temperature (considering only the intraband term and \( \omega \) real-valued) is:

¹ Levitov and co-authors also introduce an alternative hydrodynamic model applicable when the electron-electron scattering rate is non-negligible (e.g., at room temperature as considered in [R1]). In the hydrodynamic regime the nonlocal effects are washed out.
\[
\text{Re}\left\{ \sigma_{g,\text{intra}}(\omega, k_n) \right\} = \frac{\omega e^2}{k_n^2} \left\{ 2f(\omega_n, k_n)(H_{\text{intra}}(A_\alpha, B) - H_{\text{intra}}(A, B)), \quad \text{if } k_n > \omega_n, \right.
\]
\[
\left. 0, \quad \text{if } k_n < \omega_n, \quad (S3) \right. 
\]

where \(\omega_n = \hbar \omega / E_F\), \(k_n = \hbar v_F k_x / E_F\), \(f(\omega_n, k_n) = \frac{|E_F|}{8\pi \hbar v_F^2} \frac{k_n^2}{\sqrt{k_n^2 - \omega_n^2}}\), \(A_\alpha = 2 + \alpha(\omega_n - \beta k_n), \ B = \beta \omega_n - k_n\) and \(\beta = v_0 / v_F\). The function \(H_{\text{intra}}(A_\alpha, B)\) is defined by:

\[
H_{\text{intra}}(A_\alpha, B) = \begin{cases} 
G_{\text{intra}}(x_\alpha), & A_\alpha + B > 0 \text{ and } B < 0 \\
-G_{\text{intra}}(x_\alpha) \text{sgn}(B), & A_\alpha + B < 0 \text{ and } A_\alpha - |B| > 0, \\
0, & \text{otherwise} 
\end{cases}, \quad (S4) 
\]

where \(x_\alpha = -A_\alpha / B\) and \(G_{\text{intra}}(x) = x\sqrt{x^2 - 1} - \log\left(x + \sqrt{x^2 - 1}\right)\).

Importantly, the SR and Levitov (collisionless) theories agree exactly when the drift velocity vanishes (see Fig. S1a), such that:

\[
\frac{\sigma_{g,\text{no,drift}}(\omega, k_n)}{\hbar^2} \approx \frac{\omega e^2}{2F} \frac{2E_F}{\pi} \frac{1}{\omega \sqrt{\omega^2 - v_F^2 k_n^2 + \omega^2 - v_F^2 k_n^2}}. \quad (S5) 
\]

Finally, the model introduced in our article [R1] predicts (considering only the intraband effects):

\[
\sigma_{g}^{\text{Doppler}}(\omega, k_n) = (\omega / \tilde{\omega}) \sigma_{g,\text{no,drift}}(\tilde{\omega}, k_n), \quad \tilde{\omega} = \omega - k_n v_0. \quad (S6) 
\]

The simulations of the main text, as well as the results of Fig. S1, are based on the above formulas.

**Fig. S1.** Real part of the graphene conductivity in the UHP as a function of the normalized frequency \(\hbar \omega / E_F\), calculated using our theory [Eq. S6] (blue solid curve), the collisionless Levitov’ theory [Eq.
S2] (green solid curve), the Polini’s theory [Eq. S3] (purple dashed curve), and the SR theory [Eq. S1] (orange dot-dashed curve), for $k_x = 1.2k_F$, $E_p = 0.1$ eV and $\omega^* = 0^\circ$. (a) $v_0 = 0$; (b) $v_0 = 0.5v_F$; (c) $v_0 = 0.9v_F$.

Fig. S1 shows that our formalism gives results qualitatively similar to those of Levitov [R3] and Polini [R4], especially when $v_0$ is not too close to $v_F^2$. In particular, with a drift current bias (see Fig. S1b-c), the three different models predict a region of negative Landau damping ($\text{Re}\{\sigma_g^{\text{drift}}(\omega, k_x)\} < 0$) for $\omega < k_x v_0$. In contrast, the SR model does not predict a negative Landau damping regime for $\omega < k_x v_0$ (real-frequency axis).

B. About the absence of “Galilean invariance”

One of the main critiques of SR is that the Galilean transformation is not applicable to graphene. Specifically, in our model the “polarizability” $\sigma_g/(i\omega)$ is transformed by the drift-current bias using the Galilean formulas $\omega \rightarrow \tilde{\omega} = \omega - k_x v_0$ and $k_x \rightarrow \tilde{k}_x = k_x$. In contrast a relativistic-type Doppler shift transformation would give instead $\omega \rightarrow \tilde{\omega} = \gamma(\omega - k_x v_0)$ and $k_x \rightarrow \tilde{k}_x = \gamma(k_x - \omega v_0/v_F^2)$ with $\gamma = 1/\sqrt{1 - v_0^2/v_F^2}$ the graphene Lorentz factor. Importantly, the no-drift polarizability $\sigma_g^{\text{no-drift}}/(i\omega)$ is transformed by the relativistic Doppler shift as:

$$\frac{\sigma_g^{\text{no-drift}}}{i\omega} \rightarrow \frac{\sigma_g^{\text{relativistic}}}{i\omega} = \frac{e^2}{\hbar^2} \frac{2E_p}{\pi} \frac{1}{\gamma(\omega - k_x v_0)\sqrt{\omega^2 - v_F^2k_x^2 + \omega^2 - v_F^2k_x^2}} = \frac{\sigma_g^{\text{Levitov}}}{i\omega}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (S7)

because the terms $\omega^2 - v_F^2k_x^2$ are “Lorentz invariant”. In other words, the collisionless model by Levitov [R3] is “fully” relativistic and is essentially the result of applying a relativistic Doppler transformation to the no-drift polarizability.

---

2 The agreement is not accidental. It can be checked that provided the graphene Lorentz factor $\gamma = 1/\sqrt{1 - v_0^2/v_F^2}$ can be set equal to one the conductivity $\sigma_g^{\text{Levitov}}$ is coincident with ours when $\omega = -\tilde{\omega}$ (i.e., when $v_0 = 2v_{ph} = 2\omega / k_x$) which is the instability condition discussed in [R1].
From the previous discussion, it follows that our model and the one of Levitov will give similar results provided the Lorentz factor $\gamma$ is near unit and if in addition $\omega v_0 / v_F^2$ is negligible as compared to $k_x$. The most critical case is when $v_0 / v_F \rightarrow 1$. In other words, a Galilean-type transformation could arguably be problematic when $\gamma >> 1$.

**Fig. S2.** Deformed (nonequilibrium) Fermi surface ($E/E_F$ vs $k/k_F$) for a skewed Fermi distribution at zero temperature. (a) blue: $v_0 = 0$; green: $v_0 = 0.2v_F$; orange: $v_0 = 0.5v_F$. (b) purple $v_0 = 0.7v_F$; red: $v_0 = 0.8v_F$. The black lines represent the Dirac cone.

However, on this regard we note that the (collisionless) models of Refs. [R2-R4] are all based on a skewed Fermi electronic distribution. For $v_0$ approaching $v_F$ the corresponding Fermi surface becomes highly distorted (see Fig. S2). This property is rather evident for $v_0$ as “small” as $v_0 = 0.5v_F$ (graphene Lorentz factor $\gamma = 1.15$). Thus, the use of a skewed Fermi distribution is at the very least questionable when the graphene Lorentz factor ($\gamma = 1/\sqrt{1-v_0^2/v_F^2}$) deviates significantly from 1.

In our opinion any departure between our model and the other models arising due to $\gamma > 1.15$ can hardly be attributed to a failure of the Galilean invariance, as the use of a skewed Fermi distribution (which is the cornerstone on which the relativistic Doppler shift lies on) is itself arguably inadequate for $\gamma > 1.15$. Due to this reason, we believe that the raised issue of the absence of “Galilean invariance” is somewhat artificial and does not invalidate in any manner the methods used in [R1]. The theory of [R1] takes into account the linear-energy dispersion of graphene and the drift current effect without
using a skewed Fermi distribution. Our result is consistent with the heuristic idea that the electromagnetic response of an electron gas with a drift current may be somewhat analogous to that of the corresponding “moving medium” (with no drift-current bias) [R1]. For a moving medium the relevant Lorentz factor is \( \tilde{\gamma} = \sqrt{1 - v_0^2 / c^2} \approx 1 \), rather than the Lorentz factor of graphene.

To conclude, we note that our model and that of Levitov may also disagree when \( \gamma \approx 1 \), provided \( \omega v_0 / v_F^2 \) is non negligible as compared to \( k_x \), i.e., in the spectral region where the phase velocity is larger than \( v_{ph} \equiv \omega / k_x \geq v_F \left( v_F / v_0 \right) \). These “fast” waves are irrelevant in the negative Landau damping region where \( v_{ph} < v_0 \). In our view, only experimental results can decide which of the existing theories characterizes better the drift effect in the region \( \gamma < 1.15 \).

### C. Dispersion equation for the natural modes of oscillation in the graphene-dielectric-metal cavity

The dispersion equation for a system formed by a graphene sheet with drifting electrons and a plasmonic slab separated by a dielectric gap can be written as

\[
1 - R_1 R_2 e^{-2\gamma d} = 0
\]

(here \( R_1 \) and \( R_2 \) are the magnetic-field reflection coefficients at the graphene-dielectric and dielectric-metal interfaces, respectively, \( \gamma_d = \sqrt{k_x^2 - \epsilon_d \omega^2 / c^2} \), and \( d \) is the gap distance between the graphene sheet and the plasmonic slab). In the quasi-static limit \( \gamma_d \approx |k_x| = k_\parallel \), and hence the characteristic equation becomes [R1]

\[
1 - R_1 R_2 e^{-2k_\parallel d} = 0.
\]

(S8)

The reflection coefficient at the graphene-dielectric interface is given by [R1]
\[ R_i(k_x, \omega) = \frac{k_i}{k_{||} - 2\varepsilon_d \kappa_g}, \] (S9)

where \( \kappa_g(\omega) = i\omega\varepsilon_0 / \sigma_{\text{drift}}(\omega, k_x) \) and \( \sigma_{\text{drift}}(\omega, k_x) \) is the nonlocal graphene conductivity with drifting electrons. In our model, \( \sigma_{\text{drift}}(\omega, k_x) \) is calculated with Eq. (S6) and in the SR model with Eq. (S1).

In the quasi-static approximation, the magnetic field reflection coefficient at the dielectric-metal interface is given by:

\[ R_2(\omega) = \frac{\varepsilon_m(\omega) - \varepsilon_d}{\varepsilon_m(\omega) + \varepsilon_d}. \] (S10)

**D. Dispersion equation for a graphene sheet-PEC mirror cavity in the SR-theory**

Here, we consider the particular case in which the plasmonic slab discussed in Sect. C is a perfect electric conductor (PEC), so that \( R_2 = +1 \). Substituting Eq. (S1) into Eqs. (S8-S9) one finds after some simplifications that the characteristic equation for the SR model reduces to:

\[ \frac{1}{(1 - s\beta)^2 \left( \sqrt{1 - \beta^2} - \frac{s + \beta}{\sqrt{s^2 - 1}} \right)} = \frac{\pi \varepsilon_{s,d} k_y / \tilde{k}_y}{1 - e^{-2k_{||}d}}. \] (S11)

where \( \tilde{k}_y = \frac{e^2 E_F}{\varepsilon_0 (hv_F)^2} \) and \( s = \omega / |v_F k_y| \). The above equation can be easily solved with respect to \( \omega \) (or equivalently with respect to \( s \)) with numerical methods. Typically, there are three different solutions, and typically one of the solutions is associated with an unstable mode.
E. Effects of loss and interband transitions on the instabilities

To take into account the effects of loss and interband transitions in the graphene response, we model the nonlocal graphene conductivity with the Eq. (1) of the main text, but now the bare graphene nonlocal conductivity is evaluated using Eqs. (S1a) and (S1d) of the supporting material of Ref. [R5] (extended as an analytic function to the UHP). Figure Fig. S3 depicts the real and imaginary parts of the oscillation frequency of the unstable mode (for the same system illustrated in Fig. 1b of the main text) as a function of $k_x$. As seen, the drift-induced instabilities are robust to the effect of realistic loss and interband transitions in graphene.

![Fig. S3. Real (dashed curves) and imaginary (solid curves) parts of the complex oscillation frequency $\omega/(2\pi) = f' + if''$ of the unstable mode as a function of $k_x$, calculated using our model [Eq. (1) of the main text], with $E_F = 0.1$ eV, $\Gamma_{\text{ann}} = 1/(0.17 \text{ ps})$, $\omega_p/(2\pi) = 37.5 \text{ THz}$, and $d = 3 \text{ nm}$. The dielectric substrate has permittivity $\varepsilon_d = 4$.](image)

F. Incidence of an evanescent wave on a drift-current biased graphene sheet

To illustrate the consequences of the negative Landau damping, we consider a plane wave incidence problem with the graphene sheet biased with a drift current. The incident wave is TM-polarized [see Fig. S4(a)] and is characterized by the wave number $k_z$. We focus in the case in which $|k_z| > \sqrt{\varepsilon_d \omega/c}$, which corresponds to an evanescent
incident plane wave. The wave reflected by the interface is also an evanescent wave, and the superposition of the two waves generally generates a power flux towards the graphene sheet due to the material absorption. Using standard methods and the nonlocal graphene conductivity formula [Eq. (1) of the main text with the bare graphene nonlocal conductivity evaluated as in Sect. E], we numerically computed the \( z \)-component of the Poynting vector at the interface [see Fig. S4(b)].

![Diagram](image)

**Fig. S4.** (a) Sketch of a graphene sheet (with a drift-current bias) surrounded by a dielectric with relative permittivity \( \varepsilon_0 = 4 \). (b) Poynting vector component perpendicular to the interface (in arbitrary units) as a function of \( k_x \) for different drift velocities and \( f = 15 \text{ THz} \). The remaining parameters are \( E_p = 0.1 \text{ eV} \) and \( \Gamma_{\text{intra}} = 1/(0.17 \text{ ps}) \).

As expected, without the drift current [blue line in Fig. S4(b)] the \( z \)-component of the Poynting vector is negative (\( S_z < 0 \)) due to the material absorption by the graphene. In contrast, with the drift-current (green and purple lines in Fig. S4(b)) the \( z \)-component of the power flux direction may be flipped so that the energy flows away from the graphene sheet [R6]. This happens due to the negative Landau damping effect predicted in [R1], which enables the transfer of kinetic energy from the drifting electrons to the surrounding radiation field.
**G. Conductivity of a passive material in the upper-half frequency plane**

Here, we show explicitly that for a passive material (with no gain) it is necessary that $\text{Re}\{\sigma(k_x)\} > 0$ for $\omega = \omega' + i\omega''$ in the upper-half frequency plane (UHP) ($\omega'' > 0$) and $k_x$ real-valued. For simplicity, in the following we omit the dependence of $\sigma$ on $k_x$.

Assuming that the conductivity is an analytic (scalar) function in the UHP it is possible to write (from Cauchy theorem):

$$\sigma(\omega) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\infty}^{-\infty} \frac{\sigma(\xi)}{\xi - \omega} d\xi,$$

for $\omega'' > 0$. \hspace{1cm} (S12)

Thus, the real-part of the conductivity in the UHP satisfies (with $\sigma = \sigma' + i\sigma''$):

$$\sigma'(\omega) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\sigma'(\xi)\omega''}{(\xi - \omega')^2 + \omega''^2} + \frac{\sigma''(\xi)}{(\xi - \omega')^2 + \omega''^2} (\xi - \omega') d\xi. \hspace{1cm} (S13)$$

On the other hand, the Kramers-Kronig relations imply that in the real-frequency axis [R7]:

$$\sigma''(\xi) = -\frac{1}{\pi} \text{P.V.} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\sigma'(x)}{x - \xi} dx. \hspace{1cm} (S14)$$

This allows us to write:

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\sigma''(\xi)}{(\xi - \omega')^2 + \omega''^2} (\xi - \omega') d\xi$$

$$= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \sigma'(x) \text{P.V.} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\xi - \omega'}{\xi - x} \frac{1}{(\xi - \omega')^2 + \omega''^2} d\xi$$

$$= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \sigma'(x) \frac{\pi\omega''}{(x - \omega')^2 + \omega''^2}.$$

\hspace{1cm} (S15)

Hence, we get simply:
\[
\sigma'(\omega) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\sigma'(\xi)\omega^*}{(\xi - \omega')^2 + \omega^* \xi} d\xi, \quad \text{for} \quad \omega^* > 0.
\] (S16)

It is well-known that a passive material has \( \Re \{ \sigma(\omega, k_x) \} > 0 \) for \( \omega \) and \( k_x \) real-valued [R7]. Hence, the above formula implies that the same relation holds for \( \omega \) in the UHP and \( k_x \) real-valued.
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