Graphene as a source of entangled plasmons
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We analyze nonlinear optics schemes for generating pairs of quantum entangled plasmons in graphene. We predict that high plasmonic field concentration and strong optical nonlinearity of monolayer graphene enables pair-generation rates much higher than those of conventional photonic sources. The first scheme we study is spontaneous parametric down conversion in a graphene nanoribbon. In this second-order nonlinear process a plasmon excited by an external pump splits into a pair of plasmons, of half the original frequency each, emitted in opposite directions. The conversion is activated by applying a dc electric field that induces a density gradient or a current across the ribbon. Another scheme is degenerate four-wave mixing where the counter-propagating plasmons are emitted at the pump frequency. This third-order nonlinear process does not require a symmetry-breaking dc field. We suggest nano-optical experiments for measuring position-momentum entanglement of the emitted plasmon pairs. We estimate the critical pump fields at which the plasmon generation rates exceed their dissipation, leading to parametric instabilities.

I. INTRODUCTION

Graphene plasmonics has emerged as a platform for realizing strong light-matter interaction on ultrasmall length scales [1, 2].Launching, detection, and manipulation of plasmons by near-field probes has been demonstrated at infrared/THz frequencies [3–13]. High concentration of electric field, a key factor for nonlinear optical phenomena, has been achieved by exciting plasmons of wavelength of small as few hundred nanometers, about two orders of magnitude shorter than the vacuum photon wavelength . Plasmonic quality factors up to have been reached [9] in encapsulated graphene structures [5, 7], fulfilling another condition — low dissipation — necessary for prominent nonlinear effects.

Numerous theoretical [14–23] and a few experimental [24, 25] works have explored manifestations of nonlinear coupling of light to graphene in the context of conventional far-field optics. However, both nonlinear [22, 26–29] and quantum [27, 30, 31] effects could be more pronounced in the near-field domain because of plasmonic field concentration. Plasmon interaction phenomena we study in this paper include the parametric down conversion (PDC) and four-wave mixing (FWM) [32]. Spontaneous PDC and FWM can generate entangled pairs of plasmons, similar to how the usual photonic spontaneous PDC produces entangled pairs of photons [33–39].

We propose that a graphene ribbon containing an electrostatically induced p-n junction [5, 40–44], see Fig. 1(a), can be a highly efficient PDC source. The plasmon spectrum of such a system, which we will call the device of type A, consists of multiple continuously dispersing subbands. The lowest subband (labeled “0”) is gapless and the next one (labeled “1”) is gapped due to transverse confinement in the ribbon, see Fig. 1(b).

In the simplest picture, the PDC process is splitting of a mode-1 plasmon of frequency and momentum into two mode-0 plasmons of frequency and momenta that propagate away in opposite directions along the ribbon. The energy-momentum conservation (phase matching) in this conversion is guaranteed without any fine-tuning of the device. This advantage of the counterpropagating PDC scheme has been previously exploited in photonic waveguides [35, 38, 45, 46]. In a more precise description, frequencies and so the momenta of the outgoing plasmons have some uncertainty. The spontaneous PDC generates a superposition of states of different momentum

\[ \int dq f(q) |−q⟩|+q⟩. \]  (1)

This superposition is not factorizable, which implies that the pairs are position-momentum entangled, similar to particles in the original Einstein, Podolsky, and Rosen (EPR) paper [33]. The amplitude function in Eq. (1) is peaked at and has a characteristic width where

\[ \gamma = ω₀/Q \]  (2)

is the plasmon damping rate and \( v₀ = dω₀/dq₀ \) is the mode-0 plasmon group velocity.

The role of the split-gate represented by the golden bars in Fig. 1(n) is two-fold. First, it induces a gradient of carrier concentration in graphene when a dc voltage is applied between the two parts of the gate. The p-n junction is created when this voltage is high enough [42]. Such a system lacks inversion symmetry and therefore the PDC is allowed. Second, the split-gate serves as an optical antenna amplifying the incident pump field [42, 47] that excites mode-1 plasmons. The coupling is facilitated by a large transverse dipole moment of the mode-1 plasmons and a strong field enhancement \( λ_v/λ_p \gg 1 \) of the antenna.

Note that the inversion symmetry can also be broken by a dc current across a uniformly doped ribbon,
of frequency $\omega$ doping) induced by a split gate (golden bars). A pump field with a lateral $p$ dimensionless strength of the Coulomb interaction, and $\alpha$ is a characteristic scale of the plasmon velocity, $v_F = c/300$ is the Fermi velocity, $\alpha_q = e^2/(\hbar v_F)$ is the dimensionless strength of the Coulomb interaction, and $k_F$ denotes the Fermi momentum corresponding to the maximum absolute chemical potential $\mu$ in the ribbon. Dimensionless parameter $\xi_q \sim 1$ is a slow (logarithmic) function of $q$. It also depends on the doping profile of the ribbon. The dispersion law (4) is similar to that of one dimensional (1D) plasmons. 

The FWM relevant for the operation of type-C devices is analyzed in Sec. III B and the current induced PDC in type-B devices is examined in Sec. III C. Section IV contains discussion and outlook. Finally, the summary of the notations and some details of the derivations are given in the Appendix.

II. PLASMONIC PDC IN A GRAPHENE RIBBON

To simplify the analysis of a type-A device, we assume that the edges of the ribbon $y = \pm a$ are not too close to those of the split-gate, so that the dc electric field created by the gate is approximately constant across the ribbon. The induced density response of graphene can be modeled [40] assuming the local chemical potential is linear in $y$:

$$\mu(y) = \frac{a + y}{2a} \mu_a + \frac{a - y}{2a} \mu_b. \quad (3)$$

If the chemical potentials $\mu_a$ and $\mu_b$ at the two edges of the ribbon are opposite in sign, a $p-n$ junction forms. If $\mu_a = -\mu_b$, the junction is located on the midline $y = 0$ of the ribbon.

The plasmon frequency dispersion computed numerically as a function of momentum $q$ along the strip is shown in Fig. 1(b) (For related analytical results, see Ref. 50). The lowest-frequency branch, which we refer to as mode 0, is gapless:

$$\omega(q) = \xi_q \sqrt{\alpha_q a k_F v_F q} = \xi_q v_a q. \quad (4)$$

Here

$$v_a = \sqrt{(e^2/\hbar) v_F k_F a} \sim v_F \sqrt{k_F a}, \quad (5)$$

is a characteristic scale of the plasmon velocity, $v_F \approx c/300$ is the Fermi velocity, $\alpha_q = e^2/(\hbar v_F)$ is the dimensionless strength of the Coulomb interaction, and $k_F$ denotes the Fermi momentum corresponding to the maximum absolute chemical potential $\mu$. It also depends on the doping profile of the ribbon. The dispersion law (4) is similar to that of one dimensional (1D) plasmons [6, 10, 13].

The first gapped mode, mode 1, can be viewed as a linear combination of 2D plasmons of momenta $q x \pm q_y \hat{y}$ with $q_y \sim 1/a$. The frequency of this mode at $q = 0$ is

$$\omega_1 = \xi_1 \sqrt{2 \alpha_q v_a^2 k_F / a}, \quad (6)$$

which we refer to as the device of type B. In contrast, the FWM is a third-order nonlinear effect which does not require symmetry breaking fields. The degenerate FWM, in which the two pump photons of frequency $\omega$ are converted into a pair entangled plasmons of the same frequency, can take place in either a nanoribbon or a more typical larger-area graphene sheet, which are devices of type C.

Plasmonic effects similar to those we explore here have been considered in a few recent theoretical papers. For example, plasmonic sum-frequency generation in graphene nanoflakes [16] is based on the nonlinear mechanism similar to that underlying our plasmonic PDC. However, since the plasmon spectrum of a flake is discrete, only flakes of certain shapes can fulfill the energy-momentum conservation constraint for the sum (or difference) frequency generation. As mentioned above, in a long ribbon such kinematic constraints can be met without delicate fine-tuning. Another related work studied photon-plasmon difference frequency generation [25, 48] and entanglement [49], which is a phenomenon intermediate between the usual all-photon PDC [33] and our fully plasmonic PDC.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we summarize our main results for the type-A device. In the last part of that section we discuss possible experiments that can probe the plasmon entanglement. In Sec. III we consider the third-order nonlinear effects. The FWM relevant for the operation of type-C devices is analyzed in Sec. III B and the current induced PDC in type-B devices is examined in Sec. III C. Section IV contains discussion and outlook. Finally, the summary of the notations and some details of the derivations are given in the Appendix.

II. PLASMONIC PDC IN A GRAPHENE RIBBON

...
where \( \xi_1 \sim 1 \) is another dimensionless shape factor. The electric potential profile of the \( \omega_1 \) mode [Fig. 1(c)] indicates that mode-1 excitations have a nonzero dipole moment in the \( y \)-direction. Thus, they can be resonantly excited by a \( y \)-polarized pump field [51].

In this paper we describe the mode-1 to mode-0 PDC in the quantum language. However, there is a complementary classical picture, which is as follows. Plasmonic oscillations of mode-1 modulate the total carrier density of the ribbon viewed as a one-dimensional conductor. This in turn modulates the frequencies of mode-0 plasmons and causes their parametric excitation. In the standard theory of optical parametric amplification [32] (see also Appendix B), one of the generated mode-0 plasmon is referred to as the idler and the other as the signal. The idler is assumed to have a finite spectral power, e.g., due to equilibrium fluctuations in the beginning of the process. The signal is then produced from the pump and the idler by the difference frequency generation (DFG).

For weak pump fields \( E \), the pair generation rate grows linearly with the pump power, see Fig. 2. As \( E \) becomes stronger, a parametric instability is reached at some critical \( E \). At even stronger pump field, the signal exhibits an exponential growth in the undepleted pump approximation. In Sec. II A below we evaluate the dependence of the pair generation rate and the critical pump field on experimental parameters, such as the ribbon width and its doping profile.

### A. PDC Hamiltonian

The second-order nonlinear conductivity \([15, 22, 49, 52]\) leads to interaction between the plasmons of modes 0 and 1. This interaction can be modeled by the Hamiltonian \( H = H_0 + H^{(2)} \):

\[
H_0 = \hbar \omega_1 (a_1^\dagger a_1 + 1/2) + \sum_q \hbar \omega(q)(a_q^\dagger a_q + 1/2),
\]

\[
H^{(2)} = \sum_q g^{(2)}_q a_1^\dagger a_q^\dagger a_q a_{-q}^\dagger + c.c., \quad (7)
\]

where \( a_1, a_q \) are the annihilation operators for mode-1 at zero momentum and mode-0 of momentum \( q \), respectively. The interaction Hamiltonian \( H^{(2)} \) leads to pair generation in the weak coupling regime \( (g^{(2)} a_1^\dagger Q/\omega \ll 1) \) and two-mode squeezing in the strong coupling regime \( (g^{(2)} a_1^\dagger Q/\omega > 1) \), as shown in Fig. 2. Since we study the PDC on resonance, \( \omega(q_0) = \omega_0 = \omega_1/2 \), we can treat the interaction strength \( g^{(2)} \) as a constant, \( g^{(2)} = g^{(2)}_q \). As shown in Appendix C,

\[
g^{(2)} = \xi_g \frac{\pi^{1/2}}{2} \frac{e^{1/2}}{k_F^{3/4}} \frac{\beta^3}{L^{1/2}}, \quad (8)
\]

where \( L \) is the length of the gated part of the ribbon (Fig. 1) and dimensionless factor \( 0 \leq \xi_g \leq 1 \) depends on the carrier density profile across the ribbon.

The Hamiltonian \( H^{(2)} \) governs the spontaneous decay of the mode-1 plasmon into a pair of mode-0 plasmons with momenta \( q \) and \( -q \). In the weak-coupling regime, the decay rate \( \Gamma \) can be calculated using Fermi’s golden rule

\[
\Gamma = \frac{|g^{(2)}|^2 L}{\hbar^2 v_0} \left( n_0 + \frac{1}{2} \right), \quad (9)
\]

where \( n_0 \) is the occupation number of mode-0 plasmons of frequency \( \omega \simeq \omega_0 \); in thermal equilibrium, \( n_0 = 1/(e^{h\omega_0/\gamma} - 1) \) at temperature \( T \). Normalizing \( \Gamma \) to the plasmon frequency \( \omega_0 \), we obtain the dimensionless decay rate of mode-1 plasmons:

\[
\frac{\Gamma}{\omega_1} = \xi_{\text{df}} \frac{\Gamma_0}{\omega_1}, \quad \frac{\Gamma_0}{\omega_1} = \frac{\pi \hbar}{2\sqrt{\alpha_0 (k_F a)^{3/2}}}, \quad (10)
\]

where \( \xi_{\text{df}} \sim 1 \) is another dimensionless factor. The dependence of \( \xi_{\text{df}} \) on the carrier density profile across the ribbon is plotted in Fig. 3. For a ribbon with the carrier density \( n = \pm 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-2} \) at the edges and a half-width of \( a = 200 \text{ nm} \), we find \( \omega_1/(2\pi) \approx 5 \text{ THz} \) and \( \Gamma_0/\omega_1 \sim 10^{-5} \). Therefore, due to PDC alone a mode-1 plasmon decays into a mode-0 plasmon pair every \( \Gamma_0^{-1} \sim 10^{-5} \) s. If the plasmon Q-factor due to other damping channels (phonon and impurity scattering [8]) is \( Q = \omega_0/\gamma \sim 10 \), the PDC efficiency is \( \Gamma_0/\gamma \sim 10^{-7} \), which is much higher than in available photonic PDC devices [38, 53]. Furthermore, this efficiency scales as \( a^{-4} \), and so can be higher still in a narrower strip.

### B. Pumping mode-1

In a uniform ac electric field \( E \) in the \( y \)-direction, the gapped mode-1, as a harmonic oscillator, is driven to a coherent state \( |\beta\rangle = e^{\delta a_1^{\dagger}} (\beta^2/2) |0\rangle \). On resonance, \( \beta \) is

![Fig. 2. Transition from stable to unstable regime of plasmon-pair generation in the type-A device as pump field is increased. The black curve is the rate of generation of plasmon pairs per unit length. The red curve is the relative growth rate \((\kappa - \gamma)/\omega_0\) in the unstable regime. The plasmon damping rate is assumed to be \( \gamma = 0.1\omega_0 \). Other parameters are from Fig. 1 and the temperature is \( T = 300 \text{ K} \).](image-url)
found to be

\[ \beta = \xi_\beta \beta_0, \quad \beta_0 = \frac{2^{\frac{3}{2}}}{\pi^2} Q \sqrt{\frac{T}{a}} \frac{e a E}{\varepsilon_F} \]  

(11)

where \( \xi_\beta \sim 1 \) is a shape factor shown in Fig. 3. The occupation of the gapped mode modifies the pair-generation rate to

\[ R = NG \propto E^2 a^{-3/2} L, \quad N = \beta^2 \propto E^2 a^{5/2} L. \]  

(12)

For \( n = 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-2} \), \( a = 200 \text{ nm} \), \( L = 1 \mu\text{m} \), \( E = 10^3 \text{ V/cm} \) and a plasmon quality factor of \( Q \sim 10 \) for ultra clean samples at room temperature [5, 7, 9, 54], we have \( \beta_0 = 15 \), indicating an average occupation number of \( N \sim 400 \), thus boosting the generation rate to \( R \sim 4 \times 10^9 \text{s}^{-1} \). It means that there are four pairs of subharmonic plasmons generated in every nano second pulse, faster than conventional photonic [38] and quantum dot [37] (standard B therein) PDC devices.

As the pump field increases, Fermi’s golden rule ceases to be valid. The pair generation rate can be derived from the classical parametric oscillator theory (Appendix B)

\[ R = \frac{NG}{\sqrt{1 - (\kappa/\gamma)}}, \quad \kappa = \frac{\beta g^{(2)}}{\hbar}. \]  

(13)

The growth rate \( \kappa \) is to be discussed in the next section. The pair generation rate diverges at the instability threshold \( \kappa = \gamma \), as shown in Fig. 2.

C. Two mode squeezing and parametric amplification

The coupling Hamiltonian Eq. (7) in the interaction picture reads \( H_I = \sum_q g_q^{(2)} e^{-i\delta t} a_q^{\dagger} a_{-q} + c.c. \) where \( \delta = \omega_1 - 2\omega_q \) is the frequency mismatch. We focus on the pair of acoustic modes \( \omega(q_1) = \omega_0 = \omega_1/2 \) for which \( H_I \) is on resonance:

\[ H_I = g^{(2)} a_q a_{-q}^{\dagger} + c.c. \]  

(14)

When mode-1 is pumped into a coherent state, one can replace \( a_1 \) by its classical value \( \beta \). This Hamiltonian generates a two-mode-squeezing time evolution operator

\[ S(\beta g^{(2)} t/\hbar) = e^{-i\beta g^{(2)} t/\hbar}, \]  

(15)

which squeezes the pair of mode-0 plasmons at momenta \( (q, -q) \). Therefore, the plasmons are generated as two-mode squeezed states [33]. The squeezing operator leads to exponential growth of the amplitudes of the observables (e.g., the electric field of the mode) with the growth rate \( \kappa \). We define the dimensionless relative growth rate

\[ \frac{\kappa}{\omega_0} = \frac{1}{4} \xi_Q Q \frac{\zeta}{\alpha_m}, \quad \zeta = \frac{eE}{\varepsilon_F k_F} \]  

(16)

that is made only of intensive quantities. Here \( \zeta \) is the dimensionless small parameter that controls the second order nonlinear effects of graphene plasmons. Note that the relative growth rate depends only on the maximum doping level, the pump electric field, and the dimensionless shape factor \( \xi_Q \). Parameter \( \xi_Q \sim 1 \), plotted in Fig. 3, depends only on the scale invariant doping profile of the ribbon. The pump induced growth rate \( \kappa \) reduces the plasmon damping rate from \( \gamma \) to \( \gamma - \kappa \), thereby further enhancing the pair generation rate. The system reaches parametric instability at \( \kappa = \gamma \), see Fig. 2. Beyond this threshold, the plasmons are unstable with exponential growth rate \( \kappa - \gamma \). When amplifying a classical source as the seed, this effect is known as parametric amplification [32]. For \( n = 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-2} \) and \( E = 10^3 \text{ V/cm} \), we have \( \kappa = 0.12\omega_0 \) in the \( p-n \) junction regime, high enough to compete with the damping rate \( \gamma \).

The split-gate structure, as an antenna with width in \( y \) larger than the vacuum wave length \( \lambda_v \) of the incident light, could enhance the pump field \( E_v \) to the total field \( E \) by a factor of roughly \( F = E/E_v = \lambda_v/(2\pi w_v) \) [42, 47] where \( w_v \) is the distance separating the two halves of the gate, see Fig. 1. For the typical parameters in Fig. 1, one has \( \lambda_v = 43 \mu\text{m} \) at \( \omega_1 = 7 \text{THz} \) and \( w_v \) could be chosen as \( 0.5 \mu\text{m} \), rendering the field enhancement factor \( F \approx 14 \). (To increase the working frequency to, e.g., \( \omega_1 = 30 \text{THz} \) corresponding to \( \lambda_v = 10 \mu\text{m} \), the ribbon width needs to be shrunked to \( 2a \sim 20 \text{nm} \).) Therefore, to achieve the plasmon instability regime in Fig. 2, the actual incident field just needs to be of the order of \( E_v = 10^2-10^3 \text{ V/cm} \). We note that the antenna also amplifies the radiative
damping rate $\gamma_R$ of the dipolar active modes (e.g., mode-1) of the ribbon by the same factor $F$. For ribbons of size much smaller than the vacuum wavelength, $a, L \ll \lambda_v$, the normalized radiative damping rate $Q_R^{-1} = \gamma_R/\omega_0$ is amplified by the antenna from $Q_R^{-1} \sim a^2 L/\lambda_v^3$ to $aL/\lambda_v^2$, which is still much smaller than $\gamma/\omega_0 \sim 0.1$ [5, 7, 9, 54] for the parameters given above. Therefore, the intrinsic damping $\gamma$ (e.g., due to phonons and the electronic system itself) should be the major plasmon dissipation pathway in the system and the effect of the radiative damping can be neglected.

FIG. 4. (a) Schematic of the experiment setup for coincidence measurement of the energy-time entanglement of the generated EPR plasmon pairs. The plasmon pair generator can be either a type-A (Fig. 1) or type-B device (Fig. 8). The vertical yellow bars are the grating structures to convert plasmons into far field photons. (b) Illustration of the time (left) and energy (right) correlations. The widths of the ellipses are the $\Delta t$ (left) and $\Delta E$ (right).

FIG. 5. (a) The Franson scheme of measuring EPR entanglement with two scanning probes as the two interferometers. The plasmon pair generator can be either a type-A (Fig. 1) or type-B device (Fig. 8). (b) The coincidence rate as a function of $(L_1 + L_2)/\lambda$.

D. Measuring the entanglement

To detect the position-momentum entanglement of a plasmon pair, one can place grating structures on both sides of the device which would convert the plasmons to far-field photons. Passing through the beam splitters, the photons are read either by single photon detectors [33, 56] which have good time precision or those with good energy resolution, as shown in Fig. 4. The coincidence rate measured by the former as a function of path length difference gives a time uncertainty $\Delta t$, while the spectrum correlation of the energy detectors gives the energy uncertainty $\Delta E$. The EPR entanglement is manifested in the relation $\Delta t \Delta E = \Delta x \Delta p \sim hL/l < h/2$ [33, 57, 58] where $l = v_0/\gamma$ is the propagation length of the generated plasmons. This ‘energy time entanglement’ detection scheme is the same as that in Ref. [58] with the entangled photon source replaced by the plasmonic type-A device in Fig. 1 or type-B device in Fig. 8. Alternatively, homodyne detection experiments can measure the entanglement property of the squeezed state [33].

In addition, the Franson scheme [59] is also applicable as shown in Fig. 5. As mentioned in Sec. I, near field technique based on scanning probes has been successful in probing plasmons in graphene [2–13]. To implement the Franson scheme, one needs two scanning probes, as shown in Fig. 5(a). The plasmons can either travel to the scanning probes directly or after being reflected by the edges of the ribbon, which we call short and long paths respectively. The coincidence detection arises from interference between the short-short and long-long paths. If the coincidence rate between the signals from two near field tips is measured as a function of $(L_1 + L_2)/\lambda$, the distance between each tip and the edge, it will oscillate as $R_c \sim \cos^2((L_1 + L_2)/\lambda)$, like that in Fig. 5(b). However, the condition $L \ll L_i \ll l$ needs to be satisfied. The first inequality guarantees that there are no single photon (or ‘short-long’ path) interference contributions, and the second inequality ensures that plasmon damping is not important.

One can also probe the classical effects. If the pump field is comparable to the parametric instability threshold, the enhancement of plasmon lifetime can be detected. Upon pumping of the $\omega_1$ mode of the type-A
device in Fig. 1 (or type-B in Fig. 8), the ω₀ modes with momenta q and −q are parametrically driven such that their effective damping rate is reduced to γ − κ (see Appendix B), and their quality factor is boosted to ωω/(γ − κ), as shown in Fig. 6. In a scanning near-field experiment, its manifestation is simply increased propagation length of the plasmons. One can also measure near field DFG using classical interference between the signal and idler in these experiments, which is discussed in Appendix G.

III. PLASMON GENERATION BY THE THIRD-ORDER NONLINEARITY

In this section we study the effects of third order nonlinearity [14, 18, 20, 23, 60, 61] on plasmon interactions which occurs already in the long wavelength limit. This nonlinearity originates from the linearity of the dispersion of Dirac quasiparticles in graphene which breaks Galilean invariance [23]. At low frequency ω ≪ ε_F, interband effects can be neglected and the third order nonlinear conductivity σ(3) in graphene assumes the third order ‘Drude’ form

$$\sigma_{ilmn}^{(3)} = \frac{iD^{(3)}}{\omega_1\omega_2\omega_3} \Delta_{ilmn}$$

both in the kinetic [62] and hydrodynamic [23] regimes where ω_i are the frequencies of the three electric fields that generate the third order current together. The symmetric tensor Δ_{ilmn} is the sum of all isotropic tensors Δ_{ilmn} = δ_{il}δ_{mn} + δ_{im}δ_{ln} + δ_{in}δ_{lm}. Close to zero temperature (T ≪ μ), the third order optical weight is predicted to be $D^{(3)} = \frac{\varepsilon_F^4 e^4}{2\pi^2 \hbar^3 k_F}$ in the kinetic regime and twice as large in the hydrodynamic regime [23]. In what follows, we assume the system is the kinetic regime since we are mostly interested in the mid infrared plasmons whose frequencies are larger than the typical electron-electron scattering rate [22, 23].

A. FWM Hamiltonian

We start with the plasmonic effective Lagrangian of an electronic system whose linear conductivity is in the dissipation-less Drude form: $\sigma_{jk} = \frac{iD_{jk}}{\omega} \delta_{jk}$ where D is the Drude weight. In the near field approximation (meaning there is only longitudinal electric field and no magnetic field) and in the gauge $A^\mu = (0, A)$ for the electric field where A is the vector potential viewed as the plasmonic field, the Lagrangian is

$$L = \int d^3r \left( \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \dot{A}^2 - \frac{D}{2\pi^2} A^2 \delta(z) \right) + L^{(3)}$$

$$= \sum_q \left( \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \frac{2}{|q|} A_{-q} \dot{A}_q - \frac{D}{2\pi^2} A_{-q} \dot{A}_q \right) + L^{(3)}$$

where c is the speed of light. The first term is the electric field energy and the second term has the interpretation of the center of mass kinetic energy of the charge carriers. For two dimensional (2D) Drude conductors modeled as the x-y plane embedded in 3D space, since the current is localized on the 2D plane, the second term of the top line in Eq. (18) is nonzero only on the plane. In the second line of Eq. (18), $A_q = \hat{q} A_q$ are the Fourier components of A evaluated on the 2D plane. The $2/|q|$ comes from integrating over the fields exponentially decaying into the three dimensional (3D) space. Note that the summation is over $q = (q_x, q_y)$, and instead of three, there is only one plasmon mode for each $q$ since the field is constrained to be longitudinal. The resulting Euler-Lagrange equation of motion for $A_q$ yields the 2D plasmon dispersion $\omega_q = \sqrt{2D|q|}$ where the Drude weight is $D = v_F k_F e^2/\hbar$ for graphene at zero temperature. Quantization of the plasmonic field

$$A_q = i\dot{q} A_{q+} + a_q^{\dagger} - a_q$$

leads to the Hamiltonian

$$H = H_0 + H^{(3)}$$

$$H_0 = \sum_q \hbar \omega_q \left( a_q^{\dagger} a_q + \frac{1}{2} \right)$$

where S is the area of the sample.

The $H^{(3)} = -L^{(3)}$ contains products of four plasmonic creation and annihilation operators. It describes FWM which is caused by the third order optical conductivity $\sigma^{(3)}$. Writing the third order current $j^{(3)}$ in terms of vector potentials, Eq. (17) indicates $j^{(3)} = \Pi_{ilmn} A^i A^j A^m A^n / c^3$ and the interaction Hamiltonian

$$H^{(3)} = -\frac{1}{4e^4} \int d^2rR^{(3)} A^i A^j A^m A^n$$

$$= -\frac{D^{(3)}}{4e^4} \sum_q \Delta_{ilmn} A^i_{q+} A^j_{q+} A^m_{q+} A^n_{q+}$$

where the kernel $\Pi_{ilmn} = D^{(3)} \Delta_{ilmn}$ is perfectly local in space and time, and the summation runs over all $q$, constrained by $q_1 + q_2 + q_3 + q_4 = 0$ due to momentum conservation. Note that although Eq. (21) is a negative $\dot{q}^4$ term in this bosonic field theory, the system is stable due to higher order nonlinear couplings.

B. Spontaneous four wave mixing

This subsection discusses spontaneous FWM shown in Fig. 7 in uniformly doped graphene. Eq. (21) implies that entangled plasmon pairs with frequency $\omega$ can be generated by incident light of the same frequency. We model far field photon incident on the graphene plane by an uniform AC electric field with amplitude $E_0 = \omega A_0$ in the $y$ direction, and represent it by the vector potential $A_0 = \hat{y} A_0 (e^{-i\omega t} + e^{i\omega t})$ where we have assumed $A_0$ to
where the pair generation strength is its negative third order conductivity \( g^{(3)} \). The terms like mon frequency, which are red shifts in graphene due to effects in graphene. In Eqs. (20) and (22), it is enough which controls the strength of FWM and other third order effects in graphene. In Eqs. (20) and (22), it is enough to consider terms close to resonance in the interaction picture. The number conserving terms in Eq. (22) like \( a_0^\dagger a_0^\dagger \) imply the field induced Kerr shift [32] of the plasmon frequency, which are red shifts in graphene due to its negative third order conductivity [23]. The terms like \( e^{-2i\omega t}a_0^\dagger a_0^\dagger \) lead to pair generation in the weak interaction regime \( g^{(3)}Q/\omega \ll 1 \) where \( Q = \omega/\gamma \) is the plasmon quality factor and two mode squeezing (instability) in the strong interaction regime \( g^{(3)}Q/\omega > 1 \).

In the weak interaction regime, the plasmons with exactly the same frequency as \( \omega \) are generated as entangled pairs and with an angular distribution of \( (1 + 2\sin^2 \theta_q)^2 \), as shown in Fig. 7(a). The pair generation rate is determined by Fermi’s golden rule

\[
\Gamma = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar} |g^{(3)}|^2 \theta \cdot \frac{S \omega^3}{16\pi D^2} \tag{25}
\]

where \( \langle \rangle_\theta \) means angular average and the second part comes from the 2D plasmon density of states. The resulting dimensionless generation rate is

\[
\Gamma \omega = \frac{9}{2^{10}5^4 S \omega^4}{\alpha_y^2 \beta^2} \tag{26}
\]

For \( n = 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-2}, E_0 = 10^3 \text{ V/cm} \) and \( S = 1 \mu \text{m}^2 \), we have \( \Gamma/\omega = 3.2 \times 10^{-8} \). This leads to superior generation rates compared with conventional FWM sources, as we will discuss in Sec. IV. Since there is no need to break the inversion symmetry, this effect could be observed simply using uniformly doped graphene, which we call the type-C device. One may also use the ribbon in Fig. 1(a) but a lateral p-n junction is no longer necessary. The spontaneous FWM process in a transversely pumped ribbon is illustrated in Fig. 7(b). To distinguish the generated entangled plasmon pairs from the linearly excited plasmons, the key experimental signature would be satisfaction of the EPR criterion [33] in the quadrature measurement in Fig. 4 or the nonlocal interference phenomenon in the Franson experiment in Fig. 5.

In the strong interaction regime, the plasmons are squeezed in pairs and experience parametric amplification. The resulting relative exponential growth rate is

\[
Q_g^{-1} = \frac{|g^{(3)}|^2}{\hbar \omega} = \frac{\epsilon^2}{8} (1 + 2\sin^2 \theta_q) \tag{27}
\]

for the the plasmons propagating in \( \theta_q \) direction, which agrees with the classical result (see Appendix F). In a typical near field experiment shown in Fig. 7(b), this reduces the plasmon damping rate from \( \gamma \) to \( \gamma - g^{(3)}/\hbar \). Therefore, to overcome the typical damping rate \( \gamma \sim 0.1 \omega \) of graphene plasmons, one needs \( \xi \sim 0.3 \) which requires a pump field of \( E_0 \sim 10^5 \text{ V/cm} \) for \( n = 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-2} \) and \( \omega = 30 \text{THz} \).

C. Spontaneous PDC in current carrying graphene

The third order nonlinearity can also lead to PDC in a current-carrying graphene, as shown in Fig. 8. This effect can also be understood as FWM with one “pump wave” in Eq. (21) replaced by a dc current flow (\( \omega = 0 \)).
If the other pump source has frequency $2\omega$, then the process looks like a PDC: $2\omega \to \omega + \omega$. Another point of view is that the dc current with flow velocity $u$ breaks the inversion symmetry, resulting in a nonzero second order nonlinear conductivity $\alpha^2 \sim \frac{w^2 v_F}{\pi \hbar^2 k_F}$. To leading order in the dc current $J = cuu$, the equations from subsection III B can be directly applied to the present case. We assume that the pump field is polarized parallel to the dc current, such that the PDC Hamiltonian is the same as Eqs. (22) and (23) but with $\xi^2$ replaced by $\xi_2 \zeta_0$ where $\zeta_0 = eE_{dc}/(\gamma_{dc} h k_F) \approx u/v_F$ is the dimensionless parameter due to the dc electric field $E_{dc}$ that drives the dc current.

In the weak pump regime, entangled subharmonic plasmon pairs at frequency $\omega$ are generated with the angular distribution of $(1 + 2 \sin^2 \theta_q)^2$ in an infinite graphene sheet, same as that of spontaneous FWM. Summed over all angles, the total relative generation rate is the same as Eq. (26) but with $\xi^4$ replaced by $\xi_2^2 \zeta_0^2$. To measure the entanglement property of the emitted pairs, one can use the graphene ribbon in Fig. 8(b) as a plasmon pair source to perform either the energy-time entanglement measurement in Fig. 4 or the Franson scheme in Fig. 5.

In the strong pump regime, the plasmon lifetime is enhanced. The pump induced relative growth rate of plasmons of frequency $\omega$ is

$$Q_g^{-1} = \frac{1}{16} \xi_2 \omega_0 \Delta_{itmn} \hat{q}_i \hat{E}_m \hat{J}_n$$

similar to Eq. (27). Here $\hat{X}$ means the unit vector along $X$ and $\hat{q}$ is the unit vector of the momentum of the subharmonic plasmon. For a current of $J = 0.5 \text{mA}/\mu\text{m}$ at the doping level of $n = 1 \times 10^{12} \text{cm}^{-2}$ and under a pump field of $3 \times 10^5 \text{V/m}$ at $\omega_1 = 2\omega = 30 \text{THz}$ polarized along $\hat{y}$, the subharmonic plasmon running along $\hat{y}$ has a relative growth rate of $Q_g^{-1} \approx 0.03$, while those along $\hat{x}$ has a growth rate of $Q_g^{-1} \approx 0.01$, comparable to the plasmon loss at low temperatures [9].

### D. Field enhancement in a ribbon

From previous discussion, high field is essential to make the proposed devices practical. By design, these devices naturally enhance the incident field by two mechanisms, helping to achieve this goal. First, as discussed in Sec. II C(a), the split gate for type-A device in Fig. 1, or the contacts for type-B device in Fig. 8(b), act as antennas. They enhance the pump field by a factor of $F = E/E_0 = \lambda_e/(2\pi w_s) \approx 10$ [47] for the channel width $w_s = 200 \text{nm}$ and the vacuum wave length of the pump light $\lambda_e \approx 10 \mu\text{m}$ at $\omega_1 = 30 \text{THz}$. Second, close to the resonance at $\omega_1$ with the gapped mode of the ribbon (see, e.g., Fig. 1(b) and Fig. 7(b)), there is another field enhancement factor of $F_Q = \xi_f \frac{\omega^2}{(\omega - \omega_1 + i\gamma)(\omega + \omega_1 + i\gamma)}$ where $\xi_f$ is an $O(1)$ shape factor, see Eqs. (C1) and (C9) in Appendix C1. On resonance, this leads to a field enhancement factor of $F_Q \approx Q \sim 10$.

The antenna effect together with the resonance field enhancement gives a net enhancement factor of $QF \sim 100$. Therefore, the spontaneous PDC rate in the type-B device (Fig. 8) is enhanced by a factor of $(QF)^2$ while the spontaneous FWM rate in a ribbon is enhanced by $(QF)^4$. Similarly, to reach a pump field of $10^8 \text{V/m}$ for parametric instability, the external incident field just needs to be of the order of $10^4 \text{V/m}$.

Note that the resonant field enhancement also occurs in photonic cavities such as micro-ring resonators [39, 63–66]. In our devices, the vacuum photons play the role of the waveguide photons in the bus waveguide therein, and the graphene ribbon plays the role of the ring resonator. Unlike the plasmon modes in the nano-ribbon whose line width is dominated by intrinsic damping, the field enhancement on resonance in the micro-rings scales as $\sqrt{Q}$ instead of $Q$ [64] because the line width $\gamma_p$ of the photon modes in the micro-ring resonator is dominated by radiation leakage into the bus waveguide. As a result, the enhancement of the FWM pair generation rate due to resonant pumping scales as $Q^2$, see, e.g., Eq. 4 of Ref. [63]. Note also that in both our devices (short devices with length $L_0 \ll l$) and photonic cavities, the resonance conditions with the generated modes contributes to the field enhancement.
another factor of \( Q \) to the enhancement of the generation rate.

### IV. DISCUSSION AND EXPERIMENTAL OUTLOOK

We proposed several graphene spontaneous PDC and FWM devices which have promising quantum information applications as efficient sources of entangled plasmon pairs, photon-plasmon converters and parametric plasmon amplifiers [75–79], etc.

Let us compare our devices with conventional photonic PDC sources. In photonic PDC, the nonlinearity is usually characterized by a nonlinear susceptibility \( \chi^{(2)} \), which has the unit of inverse electric field. We can convert the 2D conductivity \( \sigma^{(2)} \) to an effective 3D nonlinear susceptibility \( \chi^{(2)} \) as follows. The 2D nonlinear susceptibility (in the Gaussian unit system) is [80] \( \chi^{(2)}_{2D} = \sigma^{(2)}/\omega_0 \). For the type-A device which is a ribbon with half width \( a \), the extent of the electric field of the plasmon in the out-of-plane direction is \( 1/q_\| \sim a \). Hence, the effective 3D nonlinear susceptibility is \( \chi^{(2)} \sim \chi^{(2)}_{2D}/a \sim 1/ (ek_F^2) \). For \( k_F = \sqrt{\pi} \times 10^6 \text{ cm}^{-1} \) corresponding to carrier density \( n = 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-2} \), we find \( \chi^{(2)} \sim 2 \times 10^{-6} \text{ cm/V} \), which is much larger than that of conventional photonic media, e.g., LiNbO\(_3\) [69], but is of the same order as \( \chi^{(2)} \) in sophisticated photonic waveguides made of coupled quantum wells [45, 67, 68], see Table I. Nevertheless, a more important figure of merit is the dimensionless decay factor

\[
\Gamma/\omega_0 \sim |\chi^{(2)}|^{1/2} \frac{\hbar \omega_0}{a^3} \quad (29)
\]

(same as Eq. (10) noting that \( g^{(2)} \sim \chi^{(2)} \omega_0^{3/2} a^{-1} L^{-1/2} \)) of a waveguide mode into subharmonic modes due to spontaneous PDC. Due to strong mode confinement \( (a \ll c/\omega_0) \), this figure of merit is much larger than those of photonic devices. Physically, this is because electric field of a single plasmon in our device is much larger than that of a single photon.

As discussed in Sec. III C, a comparable \( \chi^{(2)} \) can also be achieved in a type-B device where inversion symmetry is broken by applying a DC current flow to an uniformly doped ribbon if the flow velocity is moderately fast: \( u > 0.1 v_F \).

We also consider the FWM [32] in Sec. III B, a third-order nonlinear effect. Such a process does not require inversion-symmetry breaking and can take place in either a ribbon or a plain graphene sheet (type-C device in Fig. 7). This plasmon instability requires a relatively strong incident field controlled by the small parameter \( \chi^{(3)} \), but it may be easier to realize experimentally since there is no specific requirement for the nano structure. Compared with other nonlinear materials, \( \chi^{(3)} \equiv i \sigma^{(3)}/\omega a \) in graphene is much stronger, as shown in Table I.

A brief discussion of units conversion is in order. The Gaussian unit system defines the 3D nonlinear susceptibilities in terms of the effective dielectric function \( \epsilon = 1 + 4\pi [\chi + \chi^{(2)} E + \chi^{(3)} E^2 + ...] \) while the SI system defines them as \( \epsilon/\epsilon_0 = 1 + \chi_{\text{SI}} + \chi_{\text{SI}}^{(2)} E + \chi_{\text{SI}}^{(3)} E^2 + ... \) where \( \epsilon_0 \) is the vacuum permittivity. Therefore, besides converting the units of electric fields, there is an additional \( 4\pi \) factor: \( \chi^{(n)}_{\text{G}} = \chi^{(n)}_{\text{SI}}/(4\pi) \). The unit \( m^2/W \) is also used in the literature [39, 71] for third order nonlinearity \( N_3 \) defined as \( \delta N = \frac{1}{2\pi} \chi^{(3)}_{\text{SI}} E^2 = \frac{4\pi}{2\pi} \chi^{(3)}_{\text{G}} E^2 = N_3 P \) where \( N = \sqrt{1 + 4\pi N_3} \) is the linear refraction index, \( \delta N \) is the change of effective refraction index due to third order nonlinearity and the pump field, and \( P \) is the power flux of the pump field. Therefore, besides converting \( m^2/W \to 0.00132806 \text{ m}^2/\text{V}^2 \), one also needs the conversion \( \chi^{(3)}_{\text{G}} = \frac{\pi}{2\pi} N_3 \) to obtain the \( \chi^{(3)} \) in Gaussian unit.

We note that the properties of the type-A device may have substantial temperature dependence arising from the middle of the ribbon [Fig. 1(a)] where the system is close to charge neutrality. The gapped mode is an anti-symmetric charge oscillation between the upper and lower half of the strip, and thus strongly depends on the conductivity at the middle of the junction where the carriers are thermally excited electrons and holes. Therefore, the frequency of the gapped mode (the shape factor \( \xi_1 \) in Sec. II) increases with temperature. In our derivation, we included only the intraband contributions [19, 22, 49, 52] to the second order nonlinear conductivity [Eq. (C21)]. Close to the middle of the junction where \( \mu \lesssim \hbar \omega \), interband contributions may be important. There the total \( \sigma^{(2)} \) is suppressed by a factor of \((\mu/\hbar \omega)^M \) with \( M \geq 2 \) compared to the intraband expressions used in this paper, but \( \sigma^{(2)} \) may diverge at the narrow region where \( \mu = \hbar \omega \) at the interband threshold for Pauli blocking [19, 49, 52, 80–82]. This divergence is rounded by nonzero temperature, and would thus lead to substantial temperature dependence if included. We note that even in homogeneously doped graphene, there are 3 ~ 4 orders of magnitude inconsistencies [83] between theories (e.g., Refs. [19, 49, 52, 80, 81]) and experiments [24, 25]. At this stage, it is premature to include such details in the model, and instead, we provide order of magnitude scaling results for the PDC. Incidentally, experiment and theory seem to agree for \( \sigma^{(3)} \) [61].

As mentioned in Sec. I, generation of plasmons by PDC in graphene has also been considered by Ref. [49]. In that study, the pump and idler are far field photons. In contrast, here all three modes are plasmons such that frequencies are much lower and momenta are much larger, making this process much more efficient. Moreover, our proposed device involves an antenna that further increases the coupling efficiency to far field pump. As a result, the threshold power to achieve parametric instability is about four orders of magnitude lower than Ref. [49].

Since plasmons do not have the polarization degree of
heating power
dent light heats up the electron gas in graphene with the
on a chip using the modern tools of near field optics.
generate and measure the entanglement of plasmon pairs
cesses [30, 84, 85]. Here we proposed a scheme to directly
entanglement survives photon-plasmon conversion pro-
tanglement. For example, it has been shown this
cuses on the position-momentum (or energy-time) en-
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freedom (they are always longitudinally polarized), en-
tanglement of polarization frequently discussed in quan-
tum optics does not apply here. In plasmonics one
focuses on the position-momentum (or energy-time) en-
tanglement. For example, it has been shown this
entanglement survives photon-plasmon conversion pro-
cesses [30, 84, 85]. Here we proposed a scheme to directly
generate and measure the entanglement of plasmon pairs
on a chip using the modern tools of near field optics.

The following estimate shows that graphene will not be
damaged by the strong electric field required. The incident
light heats up the electron gas in graphene with the
heating power \( P_{\text{heat}} = 2\text{Re}[\sigma]|E|^2 \) and electron phonon
scattering provides its cooling channel. The cooling power is approximated by \( P_{\text{cool}} = C_e \gamma_c (T_e - T_l) \) where
\( T_e(T_l) \) is the electron(lattice) temperature, \( C_e \sim \varepsilon_F T \) is the heat capacity of the electron gas and \( \gamma_c \sim 1 \text{ps}^{-1} \) is the
cooling rate revealed by previous experiment [7]. The
lattice is a good heat conductor and is assumed to stay
at the same temperature as the environment. The
balancing of heating and cooling \( P_{\text{heat}} = P_{\text{cool}} \) determines
the stationary electron temperature \( T_e - T_l \sim 1 \frac{\gamma_c}{\varepsilon_F} \frac{\xi^2}{T} \)
where we have set the Boltzmann constant to one. At the
typical doping level and frequency scale considered in this
paper, for \( T_l = 300 \text{K} \) and \( E = 10^4 \text{V/cm} \), we conclude
that \( T_e - T_l \sim 6 \text{K} \) which is quite small compared to either
room temperature or the Fermi energy.

We worked in the kinetic regime where plasmon fre-
quency is much larger than the electron-electron scatter-
ing rate \( \omega \gg \Gamma_{ee} \) [22]. In the low frequency
hydrodynamic regime \( \omega \ll \Gamma_{ee} \) [22, 76, 86–91], the non-
linear conductivities are similar in magnitude as long
as the temperature is not much larger than chemical
potential [22, 23, 92]. Therefore, our estimate of the
generation rates should apply as well to the collective
modes in the hydrodynamic regime such as the charged
‘demons’ [22, 76, 86–90]. However, in the case of \( T \gg \mu \),
the demons become almost charge neutral, driven mainly
by kinematic pressure, and the physics could be quite
different. It may be interesting to study nonlinear and
quantum effects for these collective modes [23, 93].

Extension of these nonlinear effects to polaritonic
modes [94–96] beyond those in graphene is a meaning-
ful future direction. For example, monolayer hexagonal
boron nitride [97, 98] should exhibit strong second order
optical nonlinearity due to broken inversion symmetry
of the crystal lattice, and would be a natural platform
for generating entanglement between the long lived hy-
perbolic phonon polaritons [99–108]. Similar nonlinear
processes exist for optical phonons in SiC [109], Joseph-
son plasmons in layered superconductors [110–113] and
the collective modes in excitonic insulators [114–118].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PDC Devices</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>( Q )</th>
<th>( \chi^{(2)} ) (cm/V)</th>
<th>Generation Rate (s(^{-1})mW(^{-1}))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graphene type-A device</td>
<td>4 THz</td>
<td>10–100</td>
<td>( 2 \times 10^{-6} )</td>
<td>9 \times 10^{14}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphene type-B device</td>
<td>15 THz</td>
<td>10–100</td>
<td>( 3 \times 10^{-6} )</td>
<td>2 \times 10^{12}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semiconductor coupled</td>
<td>1–50 THz</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>( \sim 10^{-6} )</td>
<td>—.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quantum wells [45, 67, 68]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al\text{N} [69]</td>
<td>0.79 eV</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>( 2 \times 10^{-10} )</td>
<td>2 \times 10^{7}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A\text{In} [70]</td>
<td>0.80 eV</td>
<td>( 1 \times 10^5 )</td>
<td>( 4 \times 10^{-11} )</td>
<td>6 \times 10^{6}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWM Devices</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>( Q )</td>
<td>( \chi^{(3)} ) (cm(^2)/V(^2))</td>
<td>Generation Rate (s(^{-1})mW(^{-2}))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphene type-B device</td>
<td>30 THz</td>
<td>10–100</td>
<td>( 4 \times 10^{-14} )</td>
<td>6 \times 10^{14}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al\text{GaAs on Insulator}</td>
<td>0.80 eV</td>
<td>( 1 \times 10^6 )</td>
<td>( 7 \times 10^{-17} )</td>
<td>2 \times 10^{10}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silicon on Insulator</td>
<td>0.80 eV</td>
<td>( \sim 10^5 )</td>
<td>( 4 \times 10^{-17} )</td>
<td>2 \times 10^{8}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In\text{P} [73]</td>
<td>0.83 eV</td>
<td>( 4 \times 10^4 )</td>
<td>( 2 \times 10^{-16} )</td>
<td>1 \times 10^{8}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si\text{N}_4 [74]</td>
<td>0.80 eV</td>
<td>( 2 \times 10^6 )</td>
<td>( 4 \times 10^{-19} )</td>
<td>4 \times 10^{6}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE I. Comparison of graphene with conventional platforms for entangled photon generation following that in Ref. [39]. Although plasmons in these graphene devices can work in a broad frequency range from terahertz to infrared, we picked specific frequencies for estimations in the table. For graphene type-A device, the plasmon frequency is shown in Fig. 1(b) while for type-B device (with a current flow velocity of \( u = 0.1 \mu_m \)) and FWM, we used a pump frequency of 30 THz. We used a = 200 nm and the quality factor of \( Q = 10 \) for all the graphene devices. Since we are using the Gaussian unit system while the majority of nonlinear optics literature uses the SI unit, we translated from the latter in the literature to the former in this table. The refraction indices used for conversion of \( \chi^{(3)} \) are AlGaAs: \( N = 3.2 \) at \( \lambda = 1.55 \mu m \), Silicon: \( N = 3.5 \) at \( \lambda = 1.55 \mu m \), InP: \( N = 3.4 \) at \( \lambda = 1.49 \mu m \), Si\text{N}_4: \( N = 2.0 \) at \( \lambda = 1.55 \mu m \).
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Appendix A: Summary of notations for the ribbon case

The main results of this paper are written in terms of various “shape” parameters and physical quantities such as size \((a, L)\), Fermi momentum \((\varepsilon_F)\), Fermi velocity \((v_F)\), electric field \((E)\) and frequency \((\omega)\). Most of the shape parameters are dimensionless numbers of the order of unity. They are \(S\), \(S'\), \(\alpha'\), \(\eta'\), \(\xi_0\), \(\xi_1\), \(\xi_2\), \(\xi_Q\), and \(\xi_Q\). Their definitions for the case of a ribbon are as follows:

\[
S' = \int_{-1}^{1} dy \bar{\sigma}(y)|\bar{E}_0|^2, \\
S_1 = \int_{-1}^{1} dy \bar{\sigma}(y)|\bar{E}_1|^2, \\
\alpha' = \int_{-1}^{1} dy \bar{\sigma}(y)\hat{\textbf{e}} \cdot \hat{\textbf{E}}_1, \\
\eta' = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4} \int_{-1}^{1} dy \bar{\sigma}(y) \varphi_1^2 \varphi_0^2 \hat{g}(y), \\
\xi_0(q) = \frac{\omega(q)}{\sqrt{\alpha_0(ak_F)v_F}q}, \\
\xi_0 = \xi_0(q_0), \\
\xi_1 = \frac{\hbar \omega_1}{\sqrt{2\varepsilon_F^2E_F/a}}, \\
\xi_2 = \xi_1^{1/2} \frac{\eta'}{S_1^{1/2}S_0}, \\
\xi_Q = \frac{\eta'}{\xi_1 S_0^{1/2}}. \\
\xi_0 = S(a,b,z) \frac{v_a}{v_1} S_1^{1/2} S_0^{1/2}, \\
\xi_1 = \frac{1}{\xi_1} S_1^{1/2} S_0^{1/2}, \\
\xi_2 = \frac{\eta'}{\xi_1 S_0^{1/2}}. \\
\xi_Q = \frac{\eta'}{\xi_1 S_0^{1/2}}.
\]

The remaining ones, \(S\), \(\alpha\) and \(|\beta|^2\), are just the corresponding dimensionless ones multiplied by \(aL\), one half of the total area of the ribbon.

Appendix B: Parametric oscillator

The spontaneous PDC process in Sec. II is similar to what happens in a parametric oscillator (PO) except that the former leads to two-mode squeezing while the latter corresponds to single-mode squeezing [55]. Optical POs are widely used to generate subharmonic light and to create entangled photon pairs. To make the paper self-contained, we review the basic theory of the PO in this Appendix.

A PO can be modeled with the equation of motion

\[
\dot{L}x(t) = \left[ \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} + \gamma \partial_t + (1 + 2\delta \cos \Omega t) \omega_0^2 \right] x(t) = F(t),
\]

where \(\Omega\) is the frequency of the pump modulating the natural frequency \(\omega_0\) of the oscillator by a relative amount \(\sim \delta\). The difference

\[
\Delta = \Omega - 2\omega_0
\]

of \(\Omega\) from the primary parametric resonance frequency \(2\omega_0\) is referred to as the detuning. Given the initial conditions \(x(0), \dot{x}(0) \equiv \partial_t x(t)|_{t=0}\), the solution of Eq. (B1) can be written in terms of the retarded Green’s function \(G = G(t, t')\):

\[
x(t) = \{[\dot{x}(0) + \gamma x(0)]G - x(0)\partial_t G\}|_{t'=0} + \int G(t, t-\tau)\Theta(t-\tau)F(t-\tau)d\tau,
\]

where \(\Theta(t)\) is the Heaviside step-function. One simple example is \(x(0) = 0, \dot{x}(0) = 1, F(t) \equiv 0\), in which case \(x(t) = G(t, 0)\).

As usual, the Green’s function is constructed from an arbitrary pair of linearly independent solutions \(x_1(t), x_2(t)\) of the homogeneous equation \(\dot{L}x(t) = 0\):

\[
G(t, t') = \Theta(t - t')x_1(t')x_2(t) - x_2(t')x_1(t),
\]

\[
W(t) = x_1(t)\partial_t x_2(t) - x_2(t)\partial_t x_1(t).
\]

By virtue of the Abel formula, the Wronskian determinant [Eq. (B5)] has the following \(t\)-dependence:

\[
W(t) = W(0)e^{-\gamma t}.
\]

One possible choice of \(x_1(t)\) and \(x_2(t)\) is

\[
x_1(t) = e^{-\frac{1}{2} \gamma t} C \left( \frac{4\omega_0^2 - \gamma^2}{\Omega^2}, -\frac{4\delta \omega_0^2}{\Omega^2}, \frac{1}{2} \Omega t \right),
\]

\[
x_2(t) = e^{-\frac{1}{2} \gamma t} S \left( \frac{4\omega_0^2 - \gamma^2}{\Omega^2}, -\frac{4\delta \omega_0^2}{\Omega^2}, \frac{1}{2} \Omega t \right),
\]

where \(C(a, b, z)\) and \(S(a, b, z)\) are the even and the odd Mathieu functions, respectively, as defined in Mathematica [119] (Mathematica notations are MathieuC[a, b, z] and MathieuS[a, b, z]). These functions are normalized as \(C(a, 0, z) = \cos(\sqrt{a}z), S(a, 0, z) = \sin(\sqrt{a}z)\) for \(b = 0\).

From Eqs. (B4)–(B8), we conclude that

\[
G(t, 0) = \frac{x_2(t)}{x_2(0)}.
\]
so that an instability, i.e., the exponential growth of $G(t,0)$ is possible if $|\delta| > 0$. The solid lines show the exact Green’s function [Eq. (B4)], the dots are the approximations constructed from Eq. (B18). The damping rate is $\gamma = 0.1\omega_0$ corresponding to $\delta_c \approx 0.1$.

The general solution of this equation is

$$
\begin{pmatrix}
  a \\
  b
\end{pmatrix} = e^{\lambda_1 t} \begin{pmatrix}
  u_1 \\
  v_1
\end{pmatrix} + e^{\lambda_2 t} \begin{pmatrix}
  u_2 \\
  v_2
\end{pmatrix},
$$

(B15)

where

$$
\lambda_{1,2} = -\gamma \pm i\sqrt{\Delta^2 - (\omega_0 \delta)^2}
$$

(B16)

are the growth rates and

$$
\begin{pmatrix}
  u_j \\
  v_j
\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}
  \omega_0 \delta \\
  \Delta - i\gamma - i\lambda_j
\end{pmatrix}, \quad j = 1, 2
$$

(B17)

are the corresponding eigenvectors. Two linearly independent solutions for $x(t)$ could be chosen as

$$
x_j = e^{\lambda_j t} \left( u_j e^{i\omega_0 t} + v_j e^{-i\omega_0 t} \right), \quad j = 1, 2,
$$

(B18)

and the Green’s function can be constructed per Eq. (B4). Assuming $\text{Re}[\lambda_2] \geq \text{Re}[\lambda_1]$, the instability threshold is determined by the condition

$$
\text{Re}[\lambda_2] = 0,
$$

(B19)

which leads to Eq. (B10). A comparison with the exact Green’s function confirms the validity of this approximation for small damping and detuning, such as $\gamma = 0.1\omega_0$ and $\Delta = 0$ in Fig. 9.

Consider now the response of the PO to a periodic driving source

$$
F(t) = f_\omega e^{-i\omega t} + \text{c.c.},
$$

(B20)

In the stable case, $|\delta| < \delta_c$, where the effect of the initial conditions disappears at long times, $x_\omega$ is the linear response to $F$:

$$
x_\omega(t) = f_\omega e^{-i\omega t} \int_0^\infty G(t, t-\tau)e^{i\omega \tau} d\tau + \text{c.c.}
$$

(B21)

Without the pump, $G(t, t-\tau)$ is a function of $\tau$ only, and so the integral on the right-hand side reduces to a constant. Under pumping, $G(t, t-\tau)$ is periodic in $t$ with the period $2\pi/\Omega$. Accordingly, the Fourier spectrum of $x_\omega(t)$ becomes a frequency comb of Floquet harmonics $\omega + m\Omega$ where $m$ is an arbitrary integer. For small $\gamma$ and $\Delta$, however, it is easier to compute $x_\omega(t)$ not from Eq. (B21) but from Eq. (B14) supplemented with the appropriate right-hand side. The result is

$$
x_\omega(t) = \frac{f_\omega e^{-i\omega t}}{(\omega - \nu_1)(\omega - \nu_2)} \left( \frac{\Omega - 2\omega - i\gamma + \Delta}{4\omega_0} - \frac{\delta}{4} e^{i\Omega t} \right) + \text{c.c.}
$$

(B22)

Apparently, this approximation accounts only for the dominant Floquet harmonics: $\omega - \Omega, \omega$, and $\omega + \Omega$. In the
complex plane of \( \omega \), function \( x_\omega \) (or the linear response kernel) has two poles, at \( \nu_1 \) and \( \nu_2 \), given by

\[
\nu_{1,2} = \frac{\Omega}{2} + i\lambda_{1,2} = \omega_0 + \Delta - i\frac{\gamma}{2} \pm \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\Delta^2 - (\omega_0 \delta)^2}.
\]

(B23)

The pole \( \nu_2 \) has a larger imaginary part, which grows with \( |\delta| \). At \( |\delta| = \delta_c \), \( \nu_2 \) crosses over into the upper half-plane of \( \omega \), signaling the instability.

Instead of a periodic driving source, we can consider a stochastic one, namely, a Langevin source defined by the two-point correlator

\[
\langle F(t)F(0) \rangle = \frac{\gamma T}{\pi} \delta(t) .
\]

(B24)

In this case the total driving force \( F(t) \) contains a continuum of Fourier harmonics, and the response \( x(t) \) is obtained by integrating expressions like Eq. (B22) over \( \omega \). The stochastic drive leads to random fluctuations of \( x \), causing a nonzero average power injection by the parametric pump into the system:

\[
P = 2\omega_0^2 \delta \langle \cos \Omega t x \partial_t x \rangle .
\]

(A straightforward calculation based on Eqs. (B22) and (B25) yields

\[
P = \frac{(\omega_0 \delta)^2 \gamma T}{\gamma^2 + \Delta^2 - (\omega_0 \delta)^2}.
\]

(B26)

Finally, we generalize this result to the quantum case. We do not show a formal derivation, but sketch a more physical approach. The essential point is that the power injection \( P \) by the pump is enabled by the nonzero quantum/thermal fluctuations of \( x \). The starting point is a Hamiltonian of the total system (PO plus environment) in the form

\[
H(t) = H_{PO} - F(t)x + H_{env} ,
\]

(B27)

\[
H_{PO} = \frac{p^2}{2} + \frac{1}{2} (1 + 2\delta \cos \Omega t) \omega_0^2 x^2 .
\]

(B28)

The purpose of \( H_{env} \) is to describe the Langevin noise source and the dissipation effects. A standard device to achieve this is to use the Caldeira-Leggett model of a bath of harmonic oscillators. We surmise that the final answer for \( P \) is similar to the classical Eq. (B26) except the thermal energy \( T \) is replaced by \( h\omega_0 (n_b + \frac{1}{2}) \) where \( n_b = 1/(e^{\hbar \omega_0/T} - 1) \) is the boson occupation number. Since the injected power increases the energy of the PO, the pump must be generating quanta of the PO motion. Dividing \( P \) by the energy \( 2\hbar \omega_0 \) of two such quanta, we obtain the pair generation rate

\[
R = \frac{P}{2\hbar \omega_0} = \frac{\gamma}{\gamma^2 + \Delta^2 - (\omega_0 \delta)^2} \left( n_b + \frac{1}{2} \right) .
\]

(B29)

Note that formally, in the quantum mechanical language, this nonperturbative result in the parametric pump \( \delta \) can be obtained by computing the linear response to \( \delta \) (bubble diagram) [114], with the boson propagators replace by the renormalized ones by \( \delta \) [see Eq. (B22)]. As shown by Eq. (B29), at weak pumping, \( R \) scales quadratically with \( \delta \), consistent with Fermi’s Golden Rule. The precise match is obtained in the limit \( \gamma \to 0 \), \( \omega_0 \delta/\gamma \to 0 \) where \( R \) is nonzero only at the resonance, \( R \propto \delta(\Delta) \). As \( \delta \) increases, deviations from Fermi’s Golden Rule appear. As \( \delta \) approaches the critical value \( \delta_c \) [Eq. (B10)], the pair generation rate diverges.

Lastly, expressing \( \delta \) in terms of the coupling constant \( g^{(2)} \) in Sec. II and integrating over the acoustic modes in the vicinity of \( \omega_0 \) we obtain Eq. (13).

Appendix C: Derivation for the graphene ribbon

(type-A device)

1. Plasmon modes on a generic nano structure

Unlike the uniform two-dimensional (2D) electron gas, a generic conducting nano structure breaks the translational symmetry in at least one direction, and the plasmon modes can not be classified by 2D momenta. In this section, we define necessary profile functions describing the graphene nano island (e.g. a ribbon) such that the quantization could be described semi-analytically. Meanings of the dimensionless profile functions are summarized in Table II.

The linear optical conductivity is assumed local and in the Drude form: \( j(r) = \sigma(r)E(r) = \frac{1}{\pi \omega_{\text{pl}}^2} D(r)\mathbf{E}(r) \) where \( D(r) \) is the local Drude weight. This holds for \( \omega \gg \nu_{\text{pl}} q \) where \( q \) is the characteristic momentum corresponding to the plasmon modes and size of the nano structure. In the case of a graphene ribbon with \( a \) being its half width, this momentum is roughly \( q \approx \pi/(2a) \). We define the dimensionless conductivity profile function \( \sigma \) by \( \sigma(r) = \frac{\sigma(r)}{D(r)} \) (or \( D(r) = D\sigma(r) \)) where \( D \) is the maximum local Drude weight. Assume a certain plasmon mode has the charge density profile \( \rho(r) = \rho_0(r) \), its electric field profile is

\[
\mathbf{E}(r) = -\nabla \rho_0(r) = \rho_0 \mathbf{E}(r), \quad \mathbf{E}(r) \equiv -\nabla \hat{\rho}(r)
\]

(C1)

where \( \hat{\rho}(r,r') = \int dr'^2/|r - r'| \) is the Coulomb kernel. Note that \( \sigma, \hat{\rho} \) and \( \mathbf{E} \) are all dimensionless profile functions whose values are order one.

From the charge continuity equation (CCE)

\[
\partial_t \rho(r) + \nabla \cdot j = 0
\]

(C2)

with only linear conductivity, the mode \( \rho(r) = \rho_0(r) \) being an eigenmode with frequency \( \omega_1 \) implies

\[
-\omega_1 \hat{\rho}(r) - \sigma(\omega_1)\nabla \sigma(r) \nabla \hat{\rho}(r) = 0.
\]

(C3)
Define the linear operator \( \hat{L} = \nabla \tilde{\sigma}(\mathbf{r}) \nabla \), the above equation simplifies to

\[
\hat{L} \rho(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{-i\omega_1}{\sigma(\omega_1)} \tilde{\rho}(\mathbf{r}),
\]

i.e., the shape function \( \tilde{\rho}(\mathbf{r}) \) is an eigen vector of \( \hat{L} \) with eigen value \(-i\omega_1/\sigma(\omega_1)\). We define inner product to be \( (f|g) \equiv \int f^*(r)V(r,r')g(r')d^2r' d^2r \) such that \( \hat{L} \) is hermitian. Although the plasmon frequency is complex with the enhancement factor at resonance will be a pole is broadened by the plasmon damping rate.

Taking inner product with \( \tilde{\sigma}(\mathbf{r}) \), we arrive at

\[
(-i\omega - \sigma(\omega) \hat{L}) \rho(\mathbf{r}) \rho + \sigma(\omega) \nabla \tilde{\sigma}(\mathbf{r}) E_{ext} = 0.
\]

(Taking inner product with \( \rho(\mathbf{r}) \), we arrive at

\[
\begin{align*}
|\tilde{\rho}|^2 &= (\tilde{\rho}^* \tilde{\rho}) = \int \tilde{\rho}(r)V(r,r')\tilde{\rho}(r')d^2r'd^2r \\
&= \frac{\sigma(\omega_1)}{i\omega_1} \int \tilde{\sigma}(r)|\hat{E}(\mathbf{r})|^2 d^2r = \frac{\sigma(\omega_1)}{i\omega_1} S
\end{align*}
\]

and the dipole factor is

\[
\alpha = \langle \tilde{\rho} | \mathbf{e} \cdot \nabla \tilde{\sigma} \rangle = \mathbf{e} \cdot \int \tilde{\rho}(r)V(r,r')\nabla' \tilde{\sigma}(r')d^2r'd^2r
\]

\[
= \mathbf{e} \int \tilde{\sigma}(r)\hat{E}(r)d^2r.
\]

Two new shape quantities are introduced: \( S \) has the interpretation of the effective area \([16]\) of this mode, \( \alpha \) is the effective dipole moment of the mode along \( \mathbf{e} \). Therefore, the charge density amplitude induced by the external driving field is

\[
\rho = \frac{\sigma(\omega_1)}{\omega} \frac{\omega_1}{\sigma(\omega_1)} \alpha \frac{E_{ext}}{S}.
\]

In this response function, there is a simple pole at resonance \( \omega = \text{Re}[\omega_1] \), leading to divergence. However, this pole is broadened by the plasmon damping rate \( \gamma \), and the enhancement factor at resonance will be

\[
\rho = (Q_1/i)(\alpha/S)E_{ext}
\]

where \( Q_1 = \omega_1/\gamma \) is the quality factor of this plasmon mode.

2. Quantization

For each plasmon mode as a harmonic oscillator, we choose charge density \( \rho \) as the generalized coordinate and write it in terms of plasmon creation and annihilation operators as

\[
\rho = \rho_a(a + a^\dagger).
\]

Equivalently (Eq. (C1)) the electric field is

\[
\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{r}) = \rho_a(a + a^\dagger)\hat{\mathbf{E}}(\mathbf{r}).
\]

Working in the gauge \( A = (0, \mathbf{A}) \) for the vector potential, from the relation \( \mathbf{E} = -\partial_t \mathbf{A}/c, \) we can write the vector potential as

\[
\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}) = -i\rho_a(a - a^\dagger)\hat{\mathbf{E}}(\mathbf{r})
\]

where the operators are time dependent ones from the interaction picture \( a(t) = ae^{-i\omega_1 t} \).

Since the potential energy of a harmonic oscillator is half of its total energy, the quantum unit of density \( \rho_a \) can be determined by

\[
\langle V_{\text{Coulomb}} \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \rho_a^2 |\tilde{\rho}|^2 = \frac{1}{4} \hbar \omega_1
\]

which yields

\[
\rho_a = \sqrt{\hbar \omega_1/(2|\tilde{\rho}|^2)}.
\]

3. Three mode coupling due to second-order nonlinearity

In general, the current generated in response to electric field contains a second-order term

\[
\tilde{j}_i^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}, t) = \tilde{\sigma}_{ilm}^{(2)} E_i(r, t) E_m(r, t),
\]

where \( \tilde{\sigma}_{ilm}^{(2)} \) is a tensor-valued operator nonlocal in space and time. In a uniform system, this operator is diagonal in the frequency-momentum space, so that

\[
\tilde{j}_i^{(2)}(-q_3, -\omega_3) = \tilde{\sigma}_{ilm}^{(2)} E_i(q_1, \omega_1) E_m(q_2, \omega_2).
\]

where \( \omega_3 = -(\omega_1 + \omega_2), q_3 = -(q_1 + q_2), \) and

\[
\tilde{\sigma}_{ilm}^{(2)} = \tilde{\sigma}_{ilm}^{(2)}(q_1, \omega_1; q_2, \omega_2).
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Physical quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \tilde{\sigma}(\mathbf{r}) )</td>
<td>conductivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \tilde{\rho}(\mathbf{r}) )</td>
<td>2nd-order conductivity ( \sigma^{(2)} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \tilde{E}(\mathbf{r}) )</td>
<td>charge density of a mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{r}) )</td>
<td>electric field of a mode</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II. Physical meanings of the dimensionless profile functions whose typical local values are order unity.
By convention, the nonlinear second-order conductivity \( \sigma_{ilm}^{(2)} \) is symmetrized, i.e., invariant under the interchange \((1 \leftrightarrow 2, l \leftrightarrow m)\). It is convenient to define another tensor \( \Pi_{ilm} \), which describes the current response to the vector potential \( \mathbf{A} \). In the temporal gauge, \( \mathbf{E}(q, \omega) = (i\omega/c)\mathbf{A}(q, \omega) \), it is given by

\[
\Pi_{ilm}(\omega_3, q_3; \omega_1, q_1, \omega_2, q_2) \equiv -\omega_1\omega_2\sigma_{ilm}^{(2)},
\]

so that

\[
j^{(2)}_i(-\mathbf{q}_3, -\omega_3) = \frac{1}{c^2} \Pi_{ilm} A_l(q_1, \omega_1) A_m(q_2, \omega_2).
\]  

Due to inversion symmetry of graphene, \( \sigma_{ilm}^{(2)} \) vanishes at \( q_1 = q_2 = 0 \). It grows linearly with \( q_1, q_2 \) when these momenta are small. The same properties are inherited by the tensor \( \Pi_{ilm} \). In particular, in the kinetic regime of graphene \([15, 22, 49, 52]\) and neglecting dissipation, \( \Pi_{ilm} \) can be written as

\[
\Pi_{ilm} = -\frac{D^{(2)}}{\omega_1\omega_2\omega_3} \left[ \omega_2^2 q_1 + \omega_1^2 q_2 + 2\omega_1\omega_2 q_3 \right] \delta_{ilm} + \text{perm},
\]

[C21]

[When comparing to other expressions in the literature, one should remember the constraint \( \omega_k = \sum_k q_k = 0 \).] The notation “perm” stands for two additional terms obtained from the first one by the permutations

\[
(3, i; 1, l; 2, m) \rightarrow (1, l; 3, i; 2, m), \quad (3, i; 1, l; 2, m) \rightarrow (2, m; 1, l; 3, i).
\]

Accordingly, \( \Pi_{ilm} \) is symmetric under arbitrary permutations of the triads \( \{q_k, \omega_k, \mu_k\} \), where \( k = 1, 2, 3 \) and \( \mu_k = i, l, m \). This symmetry can be understood as a consequence of energy conservation.

The tensor \( \Pi_{ilm} \) defines the operator \( \Pi_{ilm} \) nonlocal in space and time. The three-mode coupling Hamiltonian can be constructed as

\[
H_c = -\frac{1}{3c^3} \int d^2r \Pi_{ilm} A_l A_m.
\]

This Hamiltonian obeys the requirement \( \partial H_c / \partial \mathbf{A} = -j^{(2)}/c \). Assume any three plasmon modes 1, 2, and 3, Eq. (C23) together with Eq. (C13) lead to their coupling Hamiltonian

\[
H_c = -\frac{2i}{\omega_1\omega_2\omega_3} \int d^2r \Pi_{ilm} E_{1l} E_{2m} \cdot \delta_{ilm} + \text{perm}.
\]

In \( \Pi \), the momenta should be replaced by spatial gradients acting on the corresponding field profiles, and the frequency arguments should match those of the creation/annihilation operators (e.g., for terms like \( a_1 a_2^\dagger a_3^\dagger \), it should be \( \Pi(1, \omega_2, \omega_3) \)).

If the nanostructure has inversion symmetry, the plasmon modes can have even or odd parity. In order for the interaction Eq. (C24) not to vanish, the product of the three fields must have even parity. In the case of subharmonic decay, the mode 0 should couple to light whose electric field is nearly uniform, and is thus an odd mode. The other two modes should be nearly identical whose product is thus even, leading the product of the three modes to be odd. Therefore, the desired subharmonic decay does not happen in inversion symmetric nano structures. We investigate the approach to break the inversion symmetry in the next section.

4. The graphene ribbon

For the graphene ribbon shown in Fig.1, there is mirror symmetry of \( x \rightarrow -x \) while the static transverse electric field breaks the mirror symmetry of \( y \rightarrow -y \). The gapped mode 1 and the acoustic mode 0 with momentum \( q \) along \( x \) have the electric potential

\[
\varphi_1 = \varphi_1(y), \quad \varphi_0 = \varphi_0(y)e^{iqx}.
\]

[C25]

Fully extracting the dependence on length scales, the effective areas can be written as

\[
S_0 = aL S'_0 = aL \int_{-1}^{1} dy \tilde{\sigma}(y) \tilde{E}_0^2,
\]

\[
S_1 = aL S'_1 = aL \int_{-1}^{1} dy \tilde{\sigma}(y) \tilde{E}_1^2,
\]

[C26]

where \( S'_0 \) and \( S'_1 \) are dimensionless factors of order one. The dipole factor for the gapped mode is

\[
\alpha = aL\alpha' = aL \int_{-1}^{1} dy \tilde{\sigma}(y) \hat{e} \cdot \tilde{E}_1.
\]

[C27]

where \( \alpha' \) is order one.

In section C2, we have assumed that the density shape functions \( \tilde{\sigma}(y) \), as transformation coefficients for the ‘generalized coordinates’ \( \rho \), are all real functions. Due to the translational invariance along \( x \), it is convenient to define the ‘complex’ modes \( \rho_q \) with well defined momenta. In the conventional quantization rule \( \rho_q = \rho_u(a_q + a_q^\dagger) \), the creation operator \( a_q^\dagger \) generates plasmon with momentum \( q \), i.e., its action adds \( hq \) to the total momenta. This set of creation and annihilation operators are related to those of Eq. (C11) by a canonical transformation.

The interaction strength—If the chemical potential on this ribbon varies slowly enough: \( 1/\lambda_u \ll \omega/v_F \) where \( \lambda_u \) is the characteristic spatial scale of chemical potential variation, one can make the local approximation, using Eq. (C21) as the local second order nonlinear coupling strength. The second order optical weight can be written as \( D^{(2)} = D_k^{(2)g}(y) \) where \( D_k^{(2)} \) is a typical value of \( D^{(2)} \) on the strip and \( g(y) \) is an order one dimensionless shape function. Given fixed chemical potential, the value of \( D_k^{(2)} \) is temperature dependent [22]. In the high
frequency kinetic regime, \(D_k^{(2)}\) goes to a constant value

\[
D_0^{(2)} = -\frac{1}{8\pi} e^3 v^2 \frac{\text{sign} \mu}{h^2} \quad \text{(C28)}
\]

at \(T \ll \mu\) and vanishes as \(T \gg \mu\). Since \(\mu \gg T\) at the edge of the strip, we define \(D_k^{(2)}\) to be its zero temperature value \(D_0^{(2)}\).

With Eqs. (C21), (C26) and (C15), the coupling Hamiltonian Eq. (C24) applied to modes 0, \(q\) and \(-q\) becomes

\[
H_c = g_q^{(2)} a_0 a_q^\dagger a_{-q}^\dagger + c.c. \quad \text{(C29)}
\]

where we have kept only the near resonant terms. Therefore, we have derived the interaction term in Eq. (7) where the interaction strength \(g\) is given by Eq. (8) with \(\xi_0 = \xi_1^{1/2} \eta'/(S_1^{1/2} S_0^{1/2})\) and the dimensionless integral \(\eta'\) defined as

\[
\eta' = q_{e q}^2 \int_{-1}^{1} dy \partial^2 \varphi_0 \varphi_0^2 g(y). \quad \text{(C30)}
\]

In the above expression for \(\eta'\), we have dropped the terms involving \(\partial_y \varphi_0\). This approximation is good if \(\partial_x \varphi_0 \gg \partial_y \varphi_0\) which is true for the subharmonic plasmons in Fig. 1(b). The dimensionless momentum \(q_{e q} = q_e a\) is order one.

In Fig. 3, we plot the resulting shape factors for the strip as the linear doping profile varies. There we have assumed the temperature and doping dependence of the Drude weight and the second order optical weight are \(D(\mu, T) = 2 e^2 h T \ln [2 \cosh (\frac{\mu}{2T})]\) and \(D_k^{(2)}(\mu, T) = D_0^{(2)} \tanh (\frac{\mu}{2T})\), so that their dimensionless profile functions are \(\tilde{\sigma}(y) = \frac{2\pi}{\mu(y)} \ln [2 \cosh \left(\frac{\mu(y)}{2T}\right)]\) and \(\tilde{g}(y) = \tanh \left(\frac{\mu(y)}{2T}\right)\).

The occupation number—Under the AC electric field of the incident light, the gapped mode \(\omega_1\) is driven to a coherent state \(|\beta(t)\rangle\) where \(\beta(t) = \beta e^{-i\omega_1 t}\). From Eq. (C11), the average value of \(\rho\) is

\[
\langle \rho \rangle = \rho_u |\beta(t)\rangle (a + a^\dagger) |\beta(t)\rangle = \rho_u (\beta e^{-i\omega_1 t} + c.c.) \quad \text{(C31)}
\]

which combined with Eq. (C10) yields

\[
\beta = (Q/i)(\alpha/S) E_{\text{ext}}/\rho_u. \quad \text{(C32)}
\]

The above equation and Eq. (C15), (6) yields Eq. (11).

**Appendix D: The EPR entanglement**

The plasmon pair state can be expressed as

\[
|\psi\rangle = \int dp_1 dp_2 f(p_1, p_2) |p_1\rangle |p_2\rangle. \quad \text{(D1)}
\]

To quantify the standard deviations, we approximate the wave function by the Gaussian form:

\[
f(p_1, p_2) = Z e^{-\frac{(p_1 + p_2)^2}{4\Delta_+^2} - \frac{(p_1 - p_2)^2}{4\Delta_-^2}} \quad \text{(D2)}
\]

where \(Z\) is a normalization factor. The original EPR state corresponds to \(\Delta_+ = 0\) and \(\Delta_- = \infty\). After measuring either momentum, the variance of the other momentum becomes \(\Delta_p^2 = 1/\left(\frac{1}{\Delta_+^2} + \frac{1}{\Delta_-^2}\right)\).

In the position basis, the state Eq. (D1) combined with Eq. (D2) is

\[
|\psi\rangle = Z \int dx_1 dx_2 e^{-\frac{\Delta_+^2 (x_1 + x_2)^2}{4}} - \frac{\Delta_-^2 (x_1 - x_2)^2}{4} + i p_0 (x_1 - x_2) |x_1\rangle |x_2\rangle. \quad \text{(D3)}
\]

After measuring either position, the variance of the other position becomes \(\Delta_x^2 = 1/\left(\Delta_+^2 + \Delta_-^2\right)\). Thus we arrive at

\[
\Delta_x^2 \Delta_p^2 = \frac{1}{2 + \frac{\Delta_-^4}{\Delta_+^4}} \leq \frac{1}{4}. \quad \text{(D4)}
\]

The apparent violation of the uncertainty principle happens whenever \(\Delta_x \neq \Delta_\pm\). In the extreme case of \(\Delta_+ = 0\) and \(\Delta_- = \infty\), we have \(|\psi\rangle = \int dp |p\rangle \langle -p|\) and \(\Delta_x \Delta_p = 0\).

If momentum is conserved in the type-A device in Fig. 1, we have \(p_1 = -p_2\) exactly satisfied. However, the length \(L\) of the device limits momentum conservation and leads to \(\Delta_+ \sim 1/L\). The damping rate limits the plasmon line width and renders \(\Delta_- \sim 1/l\) where \(l = v/\gamma\) is the propagation length of the subharmonic plasmons. Assuming the device satisfies \(L \ll l\), we have \(\Delta_x \Delta_p \sim L/l \ll 1/2\). In this case, after measuring \(p_1 > 0\), the Gaussian distribution of \(p_2\) centers at \(p_1 - 2p_0 < 0\). Thus the two detectors should lie at opposite sides of the device.

In Fig. 4(a), the two detectors as a function of optical path difference, as shown in Fig. 1(b).
Anything here should be a complete self-contained sentence or phrase that describes the content of the image.
\[ \sigma^{(2)}_{ilm}(\omega_1, \mathbf{q}_1, \omega_2, \mathbf{q}_2) = \frac{D^{(2)}_k}{\omega_1 \omega_2 \omega_3} \left[ \left( \frac{q_3 - \omega_1}{2 \omega_2} q_2 - \frac{\omega_2}{2 \omega_1} q_1 \right) \delta_{lm} + \left( 2 q_2 - 2 q_1 - \frac{\omega_2}{\omega_1} q_1 + \frac{3 \omega_1}{\omega_2} q_2 \right) \delta_{il} \right] \right]_{m}^{(\vdash 2)} \]

(E13)

where \((\omega_3, \mathbf{q}_3) = (\omega_1 + \omega_2, \mathbf{q}_1 + \mathbf{q}_2)\) and the second order optical weight is \(D^{(2)} = D^{(2)}_k \tan \left( \mu_i / (2T) \right) \) [22] whose zero temperature limit is \(D^{(2)}_0\). Applied to Eq. (E10) in the ideal case \(\mathbf{q}_1 = -\mathbf{q}_2\), and \(\Delta = 0\), we obtain the growth rate

\[ \sqrt{k_1 k_2} = \frac{3 e^3 v_F^2 q^2}{2 \hbar^2 \omega^3} \left| \phi \right|. \] (E14)

Taking into account the plasmon dispersion \(\omega_1 = \sqrt{2D\hbar q_1}\), we arrive at the dimensionless relative growth factor

\[ Q_g^{-1} = \frac{3}{16 \alpha_g} \zeta. \] (E15)

2. Graphene ribbon

Assume the \(\omega_1\) mode is excited by an external source tuned exactly at \(\omega_1\), the density is \(\rho(t) = \rho_0 e^{-i\omega_1 t} + \text{c.c.}\). Through second order nonlinearity, the strong field of mode \(\omega_1\) is going to modify the CCE of the \(\omega_0\) mode. Assuming the charge density of the subharmonic mode is \(\rho_1 = A(t) e^{-i\omega_0 t} + \text{c.c.}\), plugging it into the CCE of this mode and taking inner product with \(\bar{\rho}_1\), one obtains equation for the amplitude:

\[ \partial_t A + \kappa A^* = 0 \] (E16)

where \(|\bar{\rho}_1|^2\) is defined in Eq. (C7) and \(|\kappa| = |\beta g|/\hbar\). Eq. (E16) leads to exponentially growing solution with the relative growth rate

\[ Q_g^{-1} = \frac{|\kappa|}{\omega_0} = \zeta \frac{Q}{8 \alpha_g} \frac{\eta' \lambda'}{\xi' S_0} \] (E17)

which agrees with Eq. (16), the quantum mechanical result.

Appendix F: Classical parametric amplification via third-order nonlinearity

Assume a strong uniform electric field \(\mathbf{E} = E_0 e^{-i\omega t} + \text{c.c.}\) which, due to momentum mismatch, cannot excite plasmons through linear response. However, through third order nonlinear effect, this uniform \(\mathbf{E}\) tends to make the plasmons grow in amplitude. The CCE of the plasmons with momentum \(q\) is

\[ \partial_t \rho_q + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{j}_q = 0 \] (F1)

and the currents are

\[ j(q, \omega)_i = e (q_i E(q, \omega)_t + 3 \sigma^{(3)}_{ilmn} (-\omega, \omega, \omega) E(q, -\omega)_t E_0 m E_0 n, \]

\[ j(q, \omega)_i = -e (q_i E(q, -\omega)_t + 3 \sigma^{(3)}_{ilmn} (\omega, -\omega, \omega) E(q, \omega)_t E_0^* m E_0^* n) \] (F2)

where \(E(q)_t = -iq \delta_q \rho_q\). Thus the CCEs of the plasmon mode \(q\) at frequencies \(\omega\) and \(-\omega\) are coupled by the pump field \(E_0\), as shown in Fig. 10(b). Separating amplitude and phase of the charge density as

\[ \rho_q(t) = A(t) e^{-i\omega t} + B(t) e^{i\omega t} \] (F3)

we arrive at the equation for the amplitudes

\[ \frac{2 \partial_t}{\lambda'} \frac{\lambda}{2 \partial_t} \frac{A}{B} = 0 \] (F4)

where

\[ \lambda = 3 \sigma^{(3)}_{ilmn} (-\omega, \omega, \omega) E(q) q_i q_j E_0 m E_0 n, \]

\[ \lambda' = 3 \sigma^{(3)}_{ilmn} (\omega, -\omega, -\omega) E(q) q_i q_j E_0^* m E_0^* n. \] (F5)

Due to the fact that \(\sigma^{(3)}_{ilmn}(\omega, -\omega, -\omega) = \sigma^{(3)*}_{ilmn}(\omega, -\omega, \omega)\), we have \(\lambda' = \lambda^*\). Therefore, Eq. (F4) has the solution

\[ A(t) = A_+ e^{\kappa t} + A_- e^{-\kappa t}, \]

\[ B(t) = B_+ e^{\kappa t} + B_- e^{-\kappa t}, \] (F6)

where \(\kappa = |\lambda|\) is the growth/decay rate. Taking the ‘Drude’ form in Eq. (17) for \(\sigma^{(3)}\) of graphene in the kinetic regime, plugging in the square root dispersion of plasmons \(\omega = \sqrt{2Dq}\), the dimensionless relative growth rate \(Q_g^{-1} = \kappa/\omega\) simplifies to

\[ Q_g^{-1} = \frac{3 e^2 E_0^2 / \omega^2}{8 \hbar k_F^2} = \frac{3 \xi^2}{8} \] (F7)

for the plasmons propagating parallel to the direction of the pump field. The dimensionless small number \(\xi = \epsilon E_0^2 / \delta p / \hbar \) is simple to memorize: \(\delta p\) is just the change in electron momentum caused by the electric field during one half cycle of the oscillations, \(\delta t \sim \pi / \omega\) [23]. Note that due to third order nonlinearity, the plasmon frequency itself is also renormalized by this strong uniform field [23], and the frequency \(\omega\) throughout this section should be considered as the renormalized one.
Although a result of third order nonlinearity, this phenomenon is different from modulational instability which is ubiquitous in nonlinear optics and fluid mechanics [120], e.g. in surface gravity waves. In modulational instability, the strong pump is a finite momentum ‘wave train’ on resonance, and the exponentially growing waves have momentums different from the pump by a small amount $\delta k$. If the criterion of instability is satisfied, the growth rate scales linearly with $\delta k$. For a negative Kerr nonlinearity as for graphene plasmons [23], the criterion requires $\partial_\kappa^2 \omega > 0$, not satisfied by the square root dispersion. However, this criterion assumes a non dispersive $\sigma^{(3)}$ which is not true in graphene. Therefore, whether modulational instability happens in graphene needs further investigation and is a weaker effect anyway. Indeed, in a recent work on nonlinear plasmons [121], it was found that second order nonlinearity could lead to growth of side bands in the presence of a wave train, similar to modulational instability.

**Appendix G: Near-field probe of DFG**

In this section, we discuss a scanning near field experiment that could measure plasmonic DFG by classical interference. The setup is similar to the left part of Fig. 6. Upon pumping of the $\omega_1$ mode of the device Fig. 1(a), if the $\omega_0$ mode with momentum $q$ is launched by a classical source combined with an ‘antenna’, e.g., the left edge of the ribbon, the counter propagating mode with momentum $-q$ will be generated by DFG from the pump and the $q$ mode. The $q$ mode can be described by a coherent state $|a_q\rangle$ which satisfies $a_q^\dagger |a_q\rangle = a^|0\rangle$. The Hamiltonian (7) leads to equation of motion for the $-q$ mode:

$$\langle \partial_t + \gamma \rangle \langle a_{-q} \rangle = -i \omega_0 \langle a_{-q} \rangle - ig^{(2)} \beta a_q^\ast e^{-i\omega_0 t}/\hbar$$  \hspace{1cm} (G1)

where the phenomenological damping rate $\gamma$ has been added. The solution is

$$\langle a_{-q} \rangle = i g^{(2)} \beta \omega_0^3 \langle a_0 \rangle e^{-i\omega_0 t}/\hbar \gamma a_0^\ast e^{-i\omega_0 t}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (G2)

Therefore, if the ‘reflection coefficient’ $\kappa/\gamma$ is at the order of one, the two waves would interfere to form fringes with period $\lambda_0/2$ where $\lambda_0 = 2\pi q/\lambda$ is the wavelength of the subharmonic plasmon. These fringes could be picked up by the near field scanning probe.
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