

Hydrodynamic approach to many-body systems: exact conservation laws

Boris N. Narozhny^{a,b}

^a*Institut für Theorie der Kondensierten Materie, Karlsruher Institut für Technologie, 76131 Karlsruhe, Germany*

^b*National Research Nuclear University MEPhI (Moscow Engineering Physics Institute), 115409 Moscow, Russia*

Abstract

In this paper I present a pedagogical derivation of continuity equations manifesting exact conservation laws in an interacting electronic system based on the nonequilibrium Keldysh technique. The purpose of this exercise is to lay the groundwork for extending the hydrodynamic approach to electronic transport to strongly correlated systems where the quasiparticle approximation and Boltzmann kinetic theory fail.

Keywords: Electronic hydrodynamics, graphene, viscosity, quantum conductivity, kinetic theory

Electronic hydrodynamics has evolved into a fast paced field with multiple experimental and theoretical groups working to uncover observable signatures of hydrodynamic behavior of electronic systems [1–4] with the primary focus on transport properties. In a “realistic” case of a weakly disordered conductor, hydrodynamic equations encompass the conventional linear-response transport theory describing both the uniform Ohmic current in macroscopic (“infinite”) systems and the nonuniform viscous flows of charge and energy in constricted (“mesoscopic”) geometries [5–7].

Similarly to the traditional transport theory, hydrodynamic equations can be derived from the kinetic (Boltzmann) equation describing a system of weakly interacting quasiparticles [8]. At the semiclassical level, one often relies on the “scattering time approximation” (typically used to describe Drude-like transport phenomena [9]) to simplify the collision integral. This approach can be further extended to include quantum interference phenomena [10, 11] yielding the so-called “quantum corrections” to the leading semiclassical behavior heralding the onset of low-temperature localization [12]. These additional features “correct” the conductivity of the system, while the macroscopic description of the current flow remains Ohmic. The low-temperature Ohmic resistance is still determined by disorder, although electron-electron interaction does affect the quantum corrections [11, 13]. In contrast, the hydrodynamic behavior is dominated by electron-electron interaction determining the viscosity coefficient [14].

Systems dominated by electron-electron interactions, e.g., strongly correlated systems, “strange metals”, etc., remain a formidable challenge for several decades. In simple terms, the difficulty lies in the failure of the quasiparticle approach [15]. Moreover, even if quasiparticles could be defined the semiclassical kinetic approach may fail in multi-component systems with non-Abelian degrees of freedom (e.g., spin or isospin) due to the purely quantum nature of the latter [16]. It is then highly desirable to develop a macroscopic theory of electronic transport in strongly interacting systems without reliance on the quasiparticle paradigm and semiclassical approximation which is the ultimate motivation for this work.

In classical systems such a macroscopic theory is hydrodynamics. Indeed, the Navier-Stokes equation [17–20] equally well describes water and air flows, while the Boltzmann kinetic theory allowing one to derive this equation [21] is only justified for a dilute gas. The apparent universality of the hydrodynamic theory can be attributed to two points: (i) the long time, long distance behavior is often assumed to be independent of the details of short-distance scattering processes, and (ii) the conservation laws that are the basis of hydrodynamics are equally applicable to all systems with the same symmetries.

Email address: boris.narozhny@kit.edu (Boris N. Narozhny)

Generalizing the hydrodynamic approach to systems beyond conventional fluids, one may consider it in a broader sense meaning of a long-wavelength theory of small perturbations relative to an equilibrium state [9]. This way both the conventional hydrodynamics and diffusion [9, 22] could be discussed on equal footing. The difference between the two behaviors is momentum conservation which is assumed in hydrodynamics and is broken in diffusive systems. In solids, electronic momentum is never truly conserved (it can be lost due to scattering off impurities, phonons, etc.). However, in ultra-pure materials it may be possible to find an intermediate temperature range where electron-electron interaction is the dominant scattering process [2–4] as reflected by the hierarchy of typical time scales $\tau_{ee} \ll \tau_{\text{dis}}, \tau_{e-ph}, \dots$ (using self-evident notations). Then it could be reasonable to neglect processes that do not conserve momentum, at least as the “0-th” approximation describing the “ideal fluid” by means of macroscopic (differential) equations essentially generalizing [2, 8] the Euler’s equation [20]. The non-conserving processes (electron-impurity or electron-phonon coupling) can then be included perturbatively [2–4].

The general problem of fermions with momentum-conserving interaction has been one of the most popular in many body physics. Most generally, the system is described by a Hamiltonian comprising the one-particle (“free”) and “interaction” parts

$$\hat{H} = \hat{H}_0 + \hat{H}_{\text{int}}. \quad (1a)$$

The one-particle contribution can typically be separated into two contributions

$$\hat{H}_0 = \int d^d r_1 \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}_1) \hat{\mathcal{H}}_1^{(0)} \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}_1), \quad \hat{\mathcal{H}}_1^{(0)} = \hat{\mathcal{K}}_1 + U_1, \quad (1b)$$

with $\hat{\mathcal{K}}_1$ representing the “kinetic energy” (possibly including multiple bands, spin-orbit interaction, etc.; without loss of generality all additional quantum numbers are suppressed throughout this paper) and U_1 being the one-particle potential [the subscript “1” refers to the set of quantum numbers of the field $\hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}_1)$]. The interaction term is assumed to be translationally invariant (hence, momentum-conserving)

$$\hat{H}_{\text{int}} = \frac{1}{2} \int d^d r_1 d^d r_2 \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}_1) \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}_2) V(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}_2) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}_1). \quad (1c)$$

The general problem represented by the Hamiltonian (1) cannot be solved exactly. However, the conservation laws of particle number (charge), energy, and momentum are exact.

In this paper, I explore the emergence of exact conservation laws in the by now standard field-theoretic approach to nonequilibrium systems, the Keldysh technique [10, 23]. This issue has been already extensively discussed in literature on general many-body theory [24–26] and nuclear physics [27–29] establishing the integral relations expressing the global symmetries of the system. The present paper explores a somewhat different angle. I am interested in “deriving” the *local* continuity equations manifesting the conservation laws that are the starting point of the hydrodynamic approach (e.g., conservation of the particle number, energy, and momentum). The point is to express the macroscopic currents and densities in the most general form (i.e., in terms of the exact quantities involved in the diagrammatic technique including Green’s functions, self-energies, etc) allowing for a straightforward generalization to specific condensed matter system including multiple bands and spin-orbit interaction. The requirement of the “exact” validity of the continuity equations leads to general relations involving the self-energies and Green’s functions. These relations are satisfied by the exact functions and serve as constraints on their approximate forms. At the same time, these relations provide a blueprint for including additional, non-conserving terms to the Hamiltonian (e.g., electron-impurity or electron-phonon scattering) leading to weak decay contributions to the resulting macroscopic equations [2, 30, 31]. Finally, I compare the obtained expressions with those appearing as a result of the approximations leading to the kinetic equation (semiclassical or quantum) as an intermediate step. The ultimate goal of this work is to establish a hydrodynamic framework that does not rely on the quasiparticle paradigm (avoiding the kinetic equation and specifically the concept of the semiclassical distribution function) and hence could be useful for describing systems where quasiparticles are overdamped or altogether absent.

1. Equations of motion

In this paper I consider the conservation laws using the nonequilibrium Keldysh technique following Ref. [26]. The notations for the Keldysh Green's functions and general relations between them are summarized in Appendix A, for a more detailed account of the Keldysh technique see Refs. [10, 23].

All Green's functions are defined in terms of the Heisenberg field operators and therefore it is important to review the equations of motion governing their dynamics. Starting with the standard quantum-mechanical definition of the time derivative,

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \hat{\psi} = [\hat{\psi}, \hat{H}]. \quad (2a)$$

one finds [24]

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}, t) - \hat{\mathcal{H}}^{(0)} \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}, t) = \int d^d r' \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}', t) V(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}', t) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}, t). \quad (2b)$$

Multiplying Eq. (2b) by $i\hat{\psi}^\dagger$ from the left and taking the thermodynamic average, one arrives at the Dyson's equation for the "12" component of the Keldysh Green's function, see Eq. (A.5), but with the right-hand side (RHS) expressed explicitly in terms of the interaction potential

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} G_{1,2}^{12} - \hat{\mathcal{H}}_1^{(0)} G_{1,2}^{12} = i \int d^d r_3 \left\langle \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}_2, t_2) \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}_3, t_1) V(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_3) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}_3, t_1) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}_1, t_1) \right\rangle. \quad (3a)$$

Here and throughout the paper I use the short-hand notation: $G_{1,2}^{12} = G^{12}(\mathbf{r}_1, t_1; \mathbf{r}_2, t_2)$.

In contrast, the Dyson's equation is expressed in terms of the self-energy, see Eq. (A.5)

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} G_{1,2}^{12} - \hat{\mathcal{H}}_1^{(0)} G_{1,2}^{12} = \int d^3 [\Sigma_{1,3}^{11} G_{3,2}^{12} - \Sigma_{1,3}^{12} G_{3,2}^{22}], \quad (3b)$$

where $d^3 = d^d r_3 dt_3$. Alternatively [using Eqs. (A.10c) and the similar relation for the self-energy]

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} G_{1,2}^{12} - \hat{\mathcal{H}}_1^{(0)} G_{1,2}^{12} = \int d^3 \Xi(1, 2; 3), \quad \Xi(1, 2; 3) = \Sigma_{1,3}^R G_{3,2}^{12} + \Sigma_{1,3}^{12} G_{3,2}^A. \quad (3c)$$

Comparing Eqs. (3a) and (3c), one arrives at the identity

$$i \int d^d r_3 \left\langle \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}_2, t_2) \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}_3, t_1) V(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_3) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}_3, t_1) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}_1, t_1) \right\rangle = \int d^3 \Xi(1, 2; 3), \quad (3d)$$

relating the two-particle Green's function in the RHS of Eq. (3a) to the single-particle quantities in the RHS of Eq. (3c).

In what follows, I will also use the equation of motion for $\hat{\psi}^\dagger$

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}, t) + \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}, t) \hat{\mathcal{H}}^{(0),\dagger} = - \int d^d r' \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}, t) V(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}', t) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}', t). \quad (4)$$

Here $\hat{\mathcal{H}}^{(0),\dagger}$ is the conjugate operator with any gradients acting on the coordinate dependence to the left. Multiplying this equation by $i\hat{\psi}$ from the right one finds

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2} G_{1,2}^{12} + \hat{\mathcal{H}}_2^{(0),\dagger} G_{1,2}^{12} = -i \int d^d r_3 \left\langle \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}_2, t_2) \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}_3, t_2) V(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_3) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}_3, t_2) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}_1, t_1) \right\rangle. \quad (5a)$$

On the other hand, conjugating the Dyson's equation (3c) [see Eqs. (A.4), (A.9), (A.12), (A.13), and (A.14)] and changing the variables $1 \leftrightarrow 2$ one arrives at

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2} G_{1,2}^{12} + \hat{\mathcal{H}}_2^{(0),\dagger} G_{1,2}^{12} = \int d^3 \Xi^*(2, 1; 3) = - \int d^3 [G_{1,3}^R \Sigma_{3,2}^{12} + G_{1,3}^{12} \Sigma_{3,2}^A]. \quad (5b)$$

Comparing Eqs. (5a) and (5b) yields the conjugate form of the identity (3d).

2. Continuity equation

Consider now the usual continuity equation

$$\frac{\partial n}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{j} = 0. \quad (6)$$

The continuity equation itself is well-known and does not need another derivation. This equation represents gauge invariance (i.e., the particle number conservation or charge conservation), the symmetry that is typically assumed to be exact for all condensed matter systems (apart from the special case of superconductivity where this issue is more subtle, see Ref. [10]) and hence is independent of the particular form of the Hamiltonian. The purpose of this section is to introduce notations for the particle number density, n , and the current, \mathbf{j} , and establish the constraint imposed on the self-energy by gauge invariance.

2.1. Continuity equation at the operator level

The particle number can be defined in the standard way using electronic field operators

$$\hat{n}(\mathbf{r}, t) = \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}, t) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}, t), \quad n(\mathbf{r}, t) = \langle \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}, t) \rangle, \quad (7a)$$

or the Green's function [see Eq. (A.3a)]

$$n_1 = -iG_{1,1}^{12}. \quad (7b)$$

The two definitions allow for two different derivations of the continuity equation starting either with the equations of motion or the Dyson's equations.

At the operator level, the continuity equation is just the equation of motion for the density operator that can be obtained by combining the two equations of motion (2b) and (4)

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \hat{n}(\mathbf{r}, t) = -i\hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}, t) \hat{\mathcal{K}} \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}, t) + i \left[\hat{\mathcal{K}} \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}, t) \right]^\dagger \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}, t) = -\nabla \cdot \hat{\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{r}, t), \quad (8)$$

where the last step defines the current operator. The interaction potential does not appear in Eq. (8) due to the standard commutation relations.

2.2. Continuity equation and the Keldysh Green's functions

Combining Eq. (3c) with Eq. (5b) yields a Kadanoff-Baym equation [25]

$$\begin{aligned} \left[i \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} - \hat{\mathcal{H}}_1^{(0)} + i \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2} + \hat{\mathcal{H}}_2^{(0),\dagger} \right] G_{1,2}^{12} &= \int d3 [\Xi(1, 2; 3) + \Xi^*(2, 1; 3)] \\ &= \int d3 [\Sigma_{1,3}^R G_{3,2}^{12} + \Sigma_{1,3}^{12} G_{3,2}^A - G_{1,3}^R \Sigma_{3,2}^{12} - G_{1,3}^{12} \Sigma_{3,2}^A]. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Comparing the time derivative terms in Eq. (9) to the definition of the particle density, see Eq. (7), one notices the relation

$$\left[i \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} + i \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2} \right] G_{1,2}^{12} \Big|_{2 \rightarrow 1} = -\frac{\partial n_1}{\partial t_1}.$$

Now it becomes clear that in the limit $2 \rightarrow 1$ Eq. (9) can be written in the form of the conventional continuity equation (6) where the divergence of the current is determined by the single-particle Hamiltonian

$$\nabla_1 \cdot \mathbf{j}_1 = \left[\hat{\mathcal{K}}_1 - \hat{\mathcal{K}}_2^\dagger \right] G_{1,2}^{12} \Big|_{2 \rightarrow 1}, \quad (10)$$

while the self-energy satisfies the condition

$$\int d3 [\Sigma_{1,3}^R G_{3,1}^{12} + \Sigma_{1,3}^{12} G_{3,1}^A - G_{1,3}^R \Sigma_{3,1}^{12} - G_{1,3}^{12} \Sigma_{3,1}^A] = 0. \quad (11)$$

The latter identity is satisfied by the exact self-energy and Green's function and hence represents a constraint on any approximate expressions. In fact, the identity (11) can be derived independently, following Refs. [25, 26], where the idea of “conserving approximations” was first suggested.

2.3. Conserving approximations

The need for a “conserving approximation” arises from the apparent arbitrariness of the diagrammatic perturbation theory. Indeed, it may not be clear “a priori” that a given approximation for the self-energy satisfies the exact conservation laws of the system (given that this is certainly not the case for at least some individual diagrams; of course, any practitioner of the diagrammatic perturbation theory would make sure that the calculation does not violate gauge invariance, although this might involve certain technical difficulties – the point of a “conserving approximation” is that the conservation laws are satisfied automatically without any need for special care). Baym suggested the self-consistent procedure where one starts with the Luttinger-Ward functional

$$\Phi[\check{G}] = \left[\ln \langle \hat{\mathcal{S}}_C \rangle \right]_{\text{sk}} = \left[\langle \hat{\mathcal{S}}_C \rangle - 1 \right]_{\text{sk}}, \quad \Phi^* = \Phi, \quad (12)$$

where the subscript “sk” indicates that only skeleton diagrams (i.e. diagrams without self-energy insertions and with all Green’s functions replaced by full Green’s functions) are to be retained. Moreover, the logarithm amounts to retaining only the connected diagrams. The important property of the functional is that the exact self-energy can be obtained by the variation

$$\Sigma_{1,2}^{ij} = -(-1)^{i+j} \frac{\delta \Phi}{\delta G_{2,1}^{ji}}. \quad (13)$$

The “self-consistent” perturbation theory comprises an expansion of the functional Φ and a solution for \check{G} and $\check{\Sigma}$ using the Dyson’s equation (A.11) and Eq. (13). The latter step is self-consistent in the sense that Eq. (A.11) determines the Green’s function in terms of the self-energy and Eq. (13) the other way around. The key point of the self-consistent approach is that the resulting theory satisfies exact conservation laws without any further approximation no matter how many diagrams are retained in the expansion of the functional Φ [26]. The resulting approximations are known as “ Φ -derivable”. While there can be many such approximations (depending on the order to which Φ is expanded), all of them respect the conservation laws.

2.4. Φ -derivable approximations and gauge invariance

Applying a symmetry transformation to the exact Green’s function leads to a variation of the functional. To the leading order, the variation $\delta \Phi$ is given by

$$\delta \Phi = - \int d1 d2 \text{Tr} \check{\tau}_3 \check{\Sigma}_{1,2} \check{\tau}_3 \delta \check{G}_{2,1}, \quad (14)$$

which vanishes if the transformation corresponds to a true symmetry of the Hamiltonian.

Consider a gauge transformation (cf. the same argument of Ref. [26] but using the Matsubara Green’s functions) which without loss of generality can be confined to the upper branch of the Keldysh contour

$$\check{G}_{2,1} \rightarrow e^{i\check{\chi}_2} \check{G}_{2,1} e^{-i\check{\chi}_1}, \quad \check{\chi} = \begin{pmatrix} \chi & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (15a)$$

Expanding to the leading order in χ and taking into account the matrix structure, one finds

$$\delta \check{G}_{2,1} = i\chi_2 \frac{1+\check{\tau}_3}{2} \check{G}_{2,1} - i\chi_1 \check{G}_{2,1} \frac{1+\check{\tau}_3}{2} \quad (15b)$$

Substituting this expression into Eq. (14) and requiring that the functional is invariant under the gauge transformation (since it is composed of closed particle lines) one finds (using the cyclic property of the trace in each term separately)

$$\int d1 \chi_1 \int d2 \text{Tr} \frac{1+\check{\tau}_3}{2} [\check{\tau}_3 \check{\Sigma}_{1,2} \check{\tau}_3 \check{G}_{2,1} - \check{G}_{1,2} \check{\tau}_3 \check{\Sigma}_{2,1} \check{\tau}_3] = 0. \quad (16a)$$

Evaluating the trace and taking into account arbitrariness of χ_1 one arrives at the identity

$$\int d2 [\Sigma_{1,2}^{11} G_{2,1}^{11} - \Sigma_{1,2}^{12} G_{2,1}^{21} - G_{1,2}^{11} \Sigma_{2,1}^{11} + G_{1,2}^{12} \Sigma_{2,1}^{21}] = 0, \quad (16b)$$

which is a manifestation of gauge invariance.

Now, substituting Eqs. (A.10c) into Eq. (16b), one finds

$$\Sigma_{1,2}^{11} G_{2,1}^{11} - \Sigma_{1,2}^{12} G_{2,1}^{21} = \Sigma_{1,2}^R G_{2,1}^{12} + \Sigma_{1,2}^{12} G_{2,1}^A + \Sigma_{1,2}^R G_{2,1}^R. \quad (16c)$$

Comparing Eqs. (11) and (16b) I now conclude that in the limit $2 \rightarrow 1$ the integral in the right-hand side of Eq. (9) takes the form

$$\int d3 [\Sigma_{1,3}^R G_{3,1}^R - G_{1,3}^R \Sigma_{3,1}^R] = 0. \quad (16d)$$

This expression vanishes for the following reasons: (i) the self-energy has the same causality structure as the Green's function [23], therefore for any $t_1 \neq t_3$ the product $\Sigma_{1,3}^R G_{3,1}^R$ vanishes; (ii) in the limit $t_3 \rightarrow t_1$ the retarded Green's function has the form

$$G^R(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_3; t_1 = t_3 + 0) = -i\delta(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_3), \quad (17)$$

so that even if the self-energy had a non-zero diagonal value $\Sigma^R(1, 1)$ it would be the same in both terms and hence canceled in the difference. As a result, the identity (11) follows from Eq. (16b). The above argument represents a proof of Eq. (11) and, by extension, confirms that the continuity equation (6) is consistent with the Keldysh approach (exactly or within a Φ -derivable approximation).

2.5. Summary

To summarize this section, the continuity equation (6) manifesting particle number conservation follows from the Heisenberg equations of motion due to the “density-density” interaction, see Eq. (1c). It is fully preserved in the microscopic Keldysh approach (either while using the exact Green's functions or within a Φ -derivable – or any other conserving – approximation). At the same time, the continuity equation is satisfied within the kinetic theory (that can be derived from the same microscopic theory using a series of approximations, see Ref. [10] and Section 5) as well. Given that particle number conservation is the exact symmetry, the continuity equation is valid independently of any (correctly applied) approximation. Specifically, the arguments presented here do not rely on either the quasiparticle and semiclassical approximations typically assumed to derive the kinetic equation or otherwise describe conventional metals and semiconductors.

3. Momentum conservation

Consider now translational invariance. This is the crucial symmetry in conventional hydrodynamics, where the Navier-Stokes equation [20] is a direct consequence of momentum conservation.

Since the Hamiltonian is explicitly translationally invariant, one should be able to express momentum conservation by means of the continuity equation for the momentum density, \mathbf{g} , similarly to Eq. (6)

$$\frac{\partial g_\alpha}{\partial t} + \nabla^\beta \tau_{\beta\alpha} = 0, \quad (18)$$

without any additional derivation (here $\tau_{\alpha\beta}$ is the momentum flux – or stress – tensor). However, there are well documented difficulties along the way [24–26], primarily for long-ranged interactions.

Within the kinetic theory, one may derive the Navier-Stokes equation by multiplying the kinetic equation by momentum and integrating over all single-particle states [2, 8, 21]. The equivalent procedure at the microscopic level is to apply the momentum operator to the Dyson equations (3c) and (5b) followed by the evaluating their sum in the limit $2 \rightarrow 1$. In the resulting equation [similar to Eq. (9)], the time derivative terms combine into the time derivative of momentum density, while the rest should comprise the spatial derivatives yielding the divergence of the momentum flux tensor and the “collision integral” terms vanishing in the limit $2 \rightarrow 1$, essentially repeating the above calculation leading to the continuity equation (6).

3.1. Momentum density

The “momentum operator” mentioned above is the differential operator allowing one to define the momentum density. In quantum field theory, however, the definition of such operator is not unique [32, 33]. The reason is that only the *total momentum* of the system is well-defined. While it can be expressed as a volume integral over the momentum density, that integral remains unchanged if any contribution representing a surface term is added to the integrand. This freedom can be used to bring the stress tensor to a symmetric form typically assumed in calculations of the viscosity tensor [34–37]. Taking into account the possible additional terms (important for non rotationally invariant systems [37]), the most general form of the momentum density can be written as [cf. Eqs. (7)]

$$\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{r}, t) = \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}, t) \hat{\mathbf{p}} \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}, t) + \left[\hat{\mathbf{p}}^\dagger \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}, t) \right] \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}, t) \right\rangle, \quad (19a)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{p}}$ is the momentum operator appropriate for the system in question. Alternatively, the momentum density can be expressed in terms of the Green’s function Eq. (A.3a)

$$\mathbf{g}_1 = -\frac{i}{2} \left[\hat{\mathbf{p}}_1 + \hat{\mathbf{p}}_2^\dagger \right] G_{1,2}^{12} \Big|_{2 \rightarrow 1}. \quad (19b)$$

In conventional systems with the parabolic spectrum the momentum operator has the usual form $\hat{\mathbf{p}} = -i\nabla$ and the resulting momentum density (19b) is proportional to the particle number current (10). This proportionality does not hold in general (e.g., in the case of Dirac fermions in graphene [2, 4, 8]).

3.2. Global momentum conservation

Following the above procedure, I now apply the operator $-(i/2)[\hat{\mathbf{p}}_1 + \hat{\mathbf{p}}_2^\dagger]$ to the Dyson equations (3c) and (5b), sum up the results, and take the limit $2 \rightarrow 1$. This yields

$$\frac{\partial g_1^i}{\partial t_1} + n_1 \frac{i\hat{p}_1^i U_1 - i\hat{p}_2^{\dagger,i} U_2}{2} \Big|_{2 \rightarrow 1} + \nabla_1^j \tau_0^{ji}(1) = C_1^i, \quad (20a)$$

where

$$\nabla_1^j \tau_0^{ji}(1) = \frac{\hat{p}_1^i + \hat{p}_2^{\dagger,i}}{2} \left[\hat{\mathcal{K}}_1 - \hat{\mathcal{K}}_2^\dagger \right] G_{1,2}^{12} \Big|_{2 \rightarrow 1}, \quad (20b)$$

and [see Eqs. (3) and (5b)]

$$C_1 = -\frac{\hat{p}_1 + \hat{p}_2^\dagger}{2} \int d^3 \left[\Xi(1, 2; 3) + \Xi^*(2, 1; 3) \right] \Big|_{2 \rightarrow 1}. \quad (20c)$$

Conservation of total momentum can be demonstrated by integrating Eq. (20a) over the system volume and requiring that the volume integral of the RHS vanishes

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} \int d^d r_1 \mathbf{g}_1 + \int d^d r_1 n_1 \frac{i\hat{p}_1 U_1 - i\hat{p}_2^\dagger U_2}{2} \Big|_{2 \rightarrow 1} = 0, \quad \int d^d r_1 \mathbf{C}_1 = 0. \quad (21)$$

The integral nature of the conservation law is consistent with the fact that it is the total momentum of the system that is well defined and conserved. A local momentum flux might not be well defined if interactions are long ranged.

3.3. Φ -derivable approximations and translational invariance

The last equality in Eq. (21) represents a constraint on the approximate self energies and Green's functions and can be proven similarly to Eq. (11). Consider a coordinate shift with the operator

$$\hat{T}_{\mathbf{R}} = e^{i\mathbf{R}\cdot\hat{\mathbf{p}}}. \quad (22)$$

Confining the shift to the upper branch of the contour in analogy with Eq. (15), the transformation of the Green's function can be expressed as

$$\check{G}_{2,1} \rightarrow \frac{1+\tilde{\tau}_3}{2} \hat{T}_{\mathbf{R}} \check{G}_{2,1} \hat{T}_{\mathbf{R}}^\dagger \frac{1+\tilde{\tau}_3}{2}. \quad (23a)$$

To the leading order in \mathbf{R} , the variation of the Green's function is given by

$$\delta \check{G}_{2,1} = i \frac{1+\tilde{\tau}_3}{2} \mathbf{R}(t_2) \hat{\mathbf{p}}_2 \check{G}_{2,1} - i \mathbf{R}(t_1) \hat{\mathbf{p}}_1^\dagger \check{G}_{2,1} \frac{1+\tilde{\tau}_3}{2}. \quad (23b)$$

Substituting this expression into Eq. (14) and requiring that the functional is invariant under the shift of coordinates (since only the system boundaries are shifted) one finds (using the cyclic property of the trace in each term separately)

$$\delta \Phi = i \int d1 \mathbf{R}(t_1) \frac{\hat{\mathbf{p}}_1 + \hat{\mathbf{p}}_3^\dagger}{2} \int d2 \left[\Sigma_{1,2}^{11} G_{2,3}^{11} - \Sigma_{1,2}^{12} G_{2,3}^{21} - G_{1,2}^{11} \Sigma_{2,3}^{11} + G_{1,2}^{12} \Sigma_{2,3}^{21} \right] \Big|_{3 \rightarrow 1} = 0,$$

such that due to arbitrariness of \mathbf{R} one arrives at

$$\frac{\hat{\mathbf{p}}_1 + \hat{\mathbf{p}}_3^\dagger}{2} \int d2 \left[\Sigma_{1,2}^{11} G_{2,3}^{11} - \Sigma_{1,2}^{12} G_{2,3}^{21} - G_{1,2}^{11} \Sigma_{2,3}^{11} + G_{1,2}^{12} \Sigma_{2,3}^{21} \right] \Big|_{3 \rightarrow 1} = 0, \quad (24)$$

which is a manifestation of translational invariance.

The expression in the square brackets in Eq. (24) coincides with that in Eq. (16b), while the corresponding combination of the self-energies and Green's functions in Eq. (20c) is the same as in Eq. (11). Given that the momentum operator does not affect time dependence and hence causality, one can use the same argument as in Section 2 concluding that the terms containing products of two retarded (or two advanced) functions vanish in the limit $2 \rightarrow 1$. Thus, the identity (24) proves the second identity in Eq. (21) and consequently, the integral relation manifesting the momentum conservation.

3.4. Momentum conservation in the local approximation

A local ("differential") version of the momentum conservation law can not be established without some degree of approximation [24–26]. Within the kinetic approach, the local continuity equation for the momentum density, see Eq. (18) is obtained by a straightforward integration of the kinetic equation multiplied by momentum. This is possible because the distribution function, the central quantity the kinetic theory, is already local. In contrast, "integrating" the Kadanoff-Baym equation (9) leads to Eq. (20a). This is not a continuity equation since the quantity \mathbf{C} in the RHS *is not a divergence*, see also Refs. [24, 26].

The Kadanoff-Baym equation (9) can also be derived using the alternative form of the Dyson's equations, i.e., Eqs. (3a) and (5a). This leads to the expression for the quantity \mathbf{C} in terms of the two-particle Green's function [one could also use the identity (3d) in Eq. (20c)]

$$\mathbf{C}_1 = -\frac{i}{2} \int d^d r_3 \left[\hat{\mathbf{p}}_1 V(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_3) - \hat{\mathbf{p}}_2^\dagger V(\mathbf{r}_2 - \mathbf{r}_3) \right] \Big|_{2 \rightarrow 1} \left\langle \hat{\psi}_H^\dagger(\mathbf{r}_1, t_1) \hat{\psi}_H^\dagger(\mathbf{r}_3, t_1) \hat{\psi}_H(\mathbf{r}_3, t_1) \hat{\psi}_H(\mathbf{r}_1, t_1) \right\rangle. \quad (25)$$

This form immediately proves that the volume integral of \mathbf{C} vanishes, see Eq. (21): indeed, the integrand is antisymmetric, which reflects the third Newton's law [24].

The quantity \mathbf{C} is not a divergence since the interaction potential is nonlocal. However, for short-range interactions (e.g., for sufficiently screened Coulomb potential in solids) it is possible to construct an effective local interaction stress tensor by integrating \mathbf{C} over a large enough volume [24]

$$\int_V d^d r_1 \mathbf{C}_1 = - \int_V d^d r_1 \int d^d r_3 \mathbf{c}_+(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_3), \quad \mathbf{c}_+(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_3) = -\mathbf{c}_+(\mathbf{r}_3, \mathbf{r}_1), \quad (26a)$$

where $\mathbf{c}_+(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_3)$ is the integrand in \mathbf{C} , which can be expressed in terms of single-particle functions due to the identity (3d)

$$\mathbf{c}_+(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_3) = \frac{\hat{\mathbf{p}}_1 + \hat{\mathbf{p}}_2^\dagger}{2} \int dt_3 \left[\Xi(1, 2; 3) + \Xi^*(2, 1; 3) \right] \Big|_{2 \rightarrow 1}. \quad (26b)$$

Since $\mathbf{c}_+(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_3)$ is antisymmetric, the integral over any identical region in \mathbf{r}_1 and \mathbf{r}_3 vanishes. Thus the coordinate \mathbf{r}_3 in Eq. (26a) is effectively outside of the volume V , while \mathbf{r}_1 is inside V and the relative coordinate, $\mathbf{r}_{13} = \mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_3$, is restricted by the interaction range. Changing the integration variables in Eq. (26a) to \mathbf{r}_{13} and \mathbf{r}_3 , the integral takes the form [where $V_{\mathbf{r}_1}$ indicates that the integration volume is V in terms of the original variable \mathbf{r}_1 and $\mathbf{R}_{13} = (\mathbf{r}_1 + \mathbf{r}_3)/2$]

$$\int_V d^d r_1 \int d^d r_3 \mathbf{c}_+(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_3) = \int_{V_{\mathbf{r}_1}} d^d r_{13} d^d r_3 \mathbf{c}_+(\mathbf{R}_{13} + \mathbf{r}_{13}/2, \mathbf{R}_{13} - \mathbf{r}_{13}/2).$$

Martin and Schwinger [24] introduced the hypothesis of “local uniformity” where expectation values of field operators within a physically small region depend only on the relative coordinate. Then for a fixed \mathbf{r}_{13} the integration over \mathbf{r}_3 is restricted to a shell of thickness $\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{r}_{13}$, where \mathbf{n} is a unit vector normal to the surface of V . Now the approximation of Ref. [24] can be asserted by setting $\mathbf{R}_{13} \approx \mathbf{r}_3 \approx \text{const}$ in that shell. The integration measure over \mathbf{r}_3 can be replaced by $-\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{r}_{13} dS_3$ with the integral covering half the volume in \mathbf{r}_{13}

$$-\frac{1}{2} \int d^d r_{13} \int dS_3 (\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{r}_{13}) \mathbf{c}_+(\mathbf{r}_3 + \mathbf{r}_{13}/2, \mathbf{r}_3 - \mathbf{r}_{13}/2) = -\frac{1}{2} \int dS_3 n^i \int d^d r_{13} r_{13}^i \mathbf{c}_+(\mathbf{r}_3 + \mathbf{r}_{13}/2, \mathbf{r}_3 - \mathbf{r}_{13}/2).$$

Now one can invoke the Euler’s theorem and approximate the quantity \mathbf{C} by a divergence

$$C^i(\mathbf{r}) \approx -\nabla^j \tau_{int}^{ji}, \quad \tau_{int}^{ji} = -\frac{1}{2} \int d^d r_{13} r_{13}^j c_+^i(\mathbf{r} + \mathbf{r}_{13}/2, \mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_{13}/2). \quad (27)$$

The quantity τ_{int}^{ji} represents the interaction contribution to the stress-tensor.

Formally, one can arrive at Eq. (27) by changing the integration variable in Eq. (20c) to \mathbf{r}_{13} , expressing the integrand as $\mathbf{c}_+(\mathbf{R}_{13} + \mathbf{r}_{13}/2, \mathbf{R}_{13} - \mathbf{r}_{13}/2)$, and expanding $\mathbf{R}_{13} = \mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_{13}/2$ in \mathbf{r}_{13} such that

$$\mathbf{c}_+(\mathbf{R}_{13} + \mathbf{r}_{13}/2, \mathbf{R}_{13} - \mathbf{r}_{13}/2) \approx \mathbf{c}_+(\mathbf{r}_1 + \mathbf{r}_{13}/2, \mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_{13}/2) - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{r}_{13} \cdot \nabla_1 \mathbf{c}_+(\mathbf{r}_1 + \mathbf{r}_{13}/2, \mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_{13}/2),$$

where the contribution of the first term vanishes due to the asymmetry.

3.5. Summary

To summarize this section, the continuity equation for the momentum density (18) can be derived from the microscopic Keldysh approach (within a Φ -derivable approximation) by assuming “local uniformity” within physically small volumes [24] (or the gradient approximation, see below). For short-ranged interactions this assumption is clearly compatible with the hydrodynamic approach where one is interested in long-wavelength properties of macroscopic observables (ideally, orders of magnitude longer than any microscopic scale [20, 21]). On the other hand, for truly long-ranged interactions a local stress tensor cannot be constructed leaving only the integral manifestation of momentum conservation.

4. Energy conservation

The Hamiltonian (1) does not explicitly depend on time and hence is invariant under time translations. Hence, energy is conserved and one should be able to express this fact by means of a continuity equation

$$\frac{\partial n_E}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{j}_E = -\mathbf{j} \cdot \nabla U, \quad (28)$$

where n_E is the energy density and \mathbf{j}_E is the energy current. Strictly speaking, Eq. (28) is only exact for the case of local interactions, similarly to the case of momentum conservation.

Collisions between neutral molecules described by the traditional kinetic theory are typically assumed to be local and hence it is not surprising that Eq. (28) can be straightforwardly obtained by integrating the kinetic equation multiplied by energy [21]. At the same time, the kinetic theory description of plasma (i.e., a system – or gas – of charged particles) is only approximate and can be justified at high enough temperatures exceeding the average interaction energy or at high enough densities where the average interparticle distance is much smaller than the typical screening radius [21]. The separation between the two length scales in the problem allows one to distinguish between “collisions” – i.e. the short-distance scattering processes leading to equilibration and hence contributing to the collision integral – and collective phenomena (involving distances of the order of the screening length) that form the macroscopic fields responsible for the effective Lorentz force appearing in the left-hand side (LHS) of the kinetic equation.

4.1. Global energy conservation

At the microscopic level, one can account for energy conservation by considering time translations. Differentiating the Dyson equations (3c) and (5b) with respect to time and evaluating their *difference*, one finds

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[i \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2} \left(i \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} - \hat{\mathcal{H}}_1^{(0)} \right) - i \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} \left(i \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2} + \hat{\mathcal{H}}_2^{(0),\dagger} \right) \right] G_{1,2}^{12} = \\ & = i \int d3 \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2} [\Sigma_{1,3}^R G_{3,2}^{12} + \Sigma_{1,3}^{12} G_{3,2}^A] + i \int d3 \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} [G_{1,3}^R \Sigma_{3,2}^{12} + G_{1,3}^{12} \Sigma_{3,2}^A]. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Consider now the limit $2 \rightarrow 1$. In the LHS of Eq. (29) one immediately notices

$$\left[-\frac{\partial}{\partial t_2} \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} + \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2} \right] G_{1,2}^{12} \Big|_{2 \rightarrow 1} = 0,$$

and

$$\left[-i \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2} U_1 - i \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} U_2 \right] G_{1,2}^{12} \Big|_{2 \rightarrow 1} = U_1 \frac{\partial n_1}{\partial t_1} = -U_1 \nabla_1 \cdot \mathbf{j}_1, \quad (30)$$

where the continuity equation (6) was used in the last step. The remaining term in the LHS contains exactly the same operators as for a non-interacting system and hence can be brought to a form

$$\left[-i \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2} \hat{\mathcal{K}}_1 - i \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} \hat{\mathcal{K}}_2^\dagger \right] G_{1,2}^{12} \Big|_{2 \rightarrow 1} = \nabla_1 \cdot \mathcal{J}_1 + \frac{\partial \mathcal{E}_1^{(1)}}{\partial t_1}. \quad (31)$$

Here $\mathcal{E}^{(1)}$ is the “one-particle” (“kinetic”) energy density and \mathcal{J} is the corresponding current. Specific expressions for these quantities are determined by the quasiparticle spectrum and are easier to establish in each particular case. Note, that the current \mathcal{J} does contain an explicit interaction contribution, see below. Using Eq. (31), I may re-write Eq. (29) in the limit $2 \rightarrow 1$ as

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{E}_1^{(1)}}{\partial t_1} + \nabla_1 \cdot \mathcal{J}_1 - U_1 \nabla_1 \cdot \mathbf{j}_1 = \Upsilon_1, \quad (32a)$$

where the RHS is denoted by

$$\Upsilon_1 = i \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial t_2} \int d^3 \Xi(1, 2; 3) - \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} \int d^3 \Xi^*(2, 1; 3) \right] \Big|_{2 \rightarrow 1}. \quad (32b)$$

This quantity is related to the interaction potential, see Eq. (3d). Therefore, it is tempting to associate it with the interaction energy density. This way the volume integral of Eq. (32a) yields the integral manifestation of energy conservation

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left(\int d^d r \mathcal{E}^{(1)} + E_{int} \right) = - \int d^d r \mathbf{j} \cdot \nabla U. \quad (33)$$

4.2. Φ -derivable approximation and time translations

To prove the relation between the RHS of Eq. (29) and the interaction energy, consider a change of the time variable on the “upper” branch of the Keldysh contour

$$t \rightarrow \theta(t) = t + \varphi(t). \quad (34)$$

Together with the change of variable, the Green’s function acquires an additional factor [26]

$$\check{G}_{2,1} \rightarrow \check{U}(t_2) \check{G}_{2,1} \check{U}(t_1), \quad \check{U} = \begin{pmatrix} (\partial\theta/\partial t)^{1/4} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (35)$$

which is needed to cancel the Jacobian in Eq. (A.1b) so that the functional (12) remains invariant. Indeed, every time integration in any diagram for the functional (12) involves four Green’s function and hence to cancel the Jacobian, each of them has to be corrected by a factor of $(\partial\theta/\partial t)^{1/4}$ [26]. Expanding now in the small variation, one finds similarly to Eq. (15)

$$\delta G_{2,1}^{ij} = \delta^{i1} \left[\frac{\varphi'(t_2)}{4} + \varphi(t_2) \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2} \right] G_{2,1}^{ij} + \delta^{j1} \left[\frac{\varphi'(t_1)}{4} + \varphi(t_1) \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} \right] G_{2,1}^{ij}. \quad (36)$$

The expression (36) should now be substituted into the variation (14) of the functional Φ . This yields

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\Phi = & -\frac{1}{4} \int d1 \dot{\varphi}(t_1) \int d2 \left[\Sigma_{1,2}^{11} G_{2,1}^{11} - \Sigma_{1,2}^{12} G_{2,1}^{21} + G_{1,2}^{11} \Sigma_{2,1}^{11} - G_{1,2}^{12} \Sigma_{2,1}^{21} \right] \\ & + \int d1 \varphi(t_1) \int d2 \left[\Sigma_{1,2}^{11} \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} G_{2,1}^{11} - \Sigma_{1,2}^{12} \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} G_{2,1}^{21} + \Sigma_{2,1}^{11} \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} G_{1,2}^{11} - \Sigma_{2,1}^{21} \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} G_{1,2}^{12} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Since the time translation leaves the functional invariant, the above expression has to be set to zero, $\delta\Phi = 0$.

The first term in Eq. (37) can be re-written with the help of Eqs. (3d), (16c), and (16d) as

$$-i \int dt_1 \dot{\varphi}(t_1) E^{int},$$

where

$$E^{int} = \frac{1}{2} \int d^d r_1 \int d^d r' \langle \hat{\psi}_H^\dagger(\mathbf{r}_1, t_1) \hat{\psi}_H^\dagger(\mathbf{r}', t_1) V(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}') \hat{\psi}_H(\mathbf{r}', t_1) \hat{\psi}_H(\mathbf{r}_1, t_1) \rangle. \quad (38)$$

is the interaction energy of the system. Again, using Eqs. (16c) and (16d) one can identify the second term in Eq. (37) with the quantity Υ_1 , see Eq. (32b). This way the variation of Φ takes the form

$$\delta\Phi = -i \int dt_1 \dot{\varphi}(t_1) E^{int}(t_1) - i \int d1 \varphi(t_1) \Upsilon_1 = 0. \quad (39)$$

Integrating the first term by parts and using arbitrariness of $\varphi(t_1)$, one arrives at the identity

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} E^{int} + \int d^d r \Upsilon = 0, \quad (40)$$

which is a manifestation of energy conservation and the justification for Eq. (33).

4.3. Energy conservation in the local approximation

I now construct the local expression of energy conservation using the same “local uniformity” approximation as in the case of momentum conservation. Starting with Eq. (32a), one should notice that its LHS contains the time derivative of the one-particle energy density only. To arrive at the total energy density one has to separate the “interaction energy” density from the RHS. To this end, let me re-write Υ with the help of Eq. (3d) as

$$\begin{aligned} \Upsilon_1 = & -\frac{\partial}{\partial t_2} \int d^d r_3 \left\langle \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}_2, t_2) \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}_3, t_1) V(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_3) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}_3, t_1) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}_1, t_1) \right\rangle \Big|_{2 \rightarrow 1} \\ & - \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} \int d^d r_3 \left\langle \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}_2, t_2) \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}_3, t_2) V(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_3) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}_3, t_2) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}_1, t_1) \right\rangle \Big|_{2 \rightarrow 1}. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Singling out the interaction energy, see Eq. (38), this can be brought to the following form

$$\begin{aligned} \Upsilon_1 = & -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} \int d^d r_3 \left\langle \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}_1, t_1) \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}_3, t_1) V(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_3) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}_3, t_1) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}_1, t_1) \right\rangle \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \int d^d r_3 V(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_3) \left\langle \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}_1, t_1) \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} \left[\hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}_3, t_1) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}_3, t_1) \right] \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}_1, t_1) \right\rangle \\ & - \frac{1}{2} \int d^d r_3 V(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_3) \left\langle \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}_3, t_1) \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} \left[\hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}_1, t_1) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}_1, t_1) \right] \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}_3, t_1) \right\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

Introducing the interaction energy density \mathcal{E}^{int} in the first term and using the operator relation (8) in the last two, I find

$$\begin{aligned} \Upsilon_1 = & -\frac{\partial \mathcal{E}^{int}}{\partial t_1} - \frac{1}{2} \int d^d r_3 V(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_3) \left\langle \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}_1, t_1) \nabla_3 \hat{\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{r}_3, t_1) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}_1, t_1) \right\rangle \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \int d^d r_3 V(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_3) \left\langle \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}_3, t_1) \nabla_1 \hat{\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{r}_1, t_1) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}_3, t_1) \right\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Substituting the above expression into Eq. (32a) one can now combine the time derivative terms into the derivative of the total energy density, $n_E = \mathcal{E}^{(1)} + \mathcal{E}^{int}$.

To proceed further one need to specify the gradient term in Eq. (32a). Without loss of generality, I can write the “kinetic” part of the Hamiltonian (1) as

$$\hat{\mathcal{K}} = \nabla \cdot \hat{\mathbf{K}}, \quad (44)$$

where the vector $\hat{\mathbf{K}}$ carries the dependence on all additional quantum numbers. The rationale for Eq. (44) is the following. Kinetic energy describes motion and hence the corresponding operator must not commute with the coordinate. Therefore, $\hat{\mathcal{K}}$ must be a functional of the gradient operator, ∇ , and moreover the formal Taylor series in ∇ must start with the first power. Thus each term in the series is proportional to ∇ leading to Eq. (44). Note that $\hat{\mathbf{K}}$ may further depend on ∇ as in the case of the usual parabolic spectrum where $\hat{\mathbf{K}} = -\nabla/(2m)$, while for Dirac fermions in graphene $\hat{\mathbf{K}} = -iv_g \boldsymbol{\sigma}$, where v_g is the Fermi velocity and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ is the vector of the Pauli matrices [38].

Using Eq. (44), one can arrive at the “explicit” expressions for $\mathcal{E}^{(1)}$ and \mathcal{J} by evaluating the LHS of Eq. (31). These read

$$\mathcal{E}_1^{(1)} = -i \nabla_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{K}}_2 G_{1,2}^{12} \Big|_{2 \rightarrow 1}, \quad \mathcal{J}_1 = i \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} \hat{\mathbf{K}}_2 + \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2} \hat{\mathbf{K}}_1 \right) G_{1,2}^{12} \Big|_{2 \rightarrow 1}. \quad (45)$$

Taking into account the explicit form of $G_{1,2}^{12}$ in terms of the field operators, Eq. (A.3a) and using the equations of motion (2b) and (4) to remove the time derivative from \mathcal{J}_ϵ , one finds following expression

$$\mathcal{J}_1 = \mathbf{j}_\epsilon^{(1)}(1) + U_1 \mathbf{j} + \int d^d r_3 V(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_3) \left\langle \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}_3, t_1) \nabla_1 \hat{\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{r}_1, t_1) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}_3, t_1) \right\rangle, \quad (46)$$

where the one-particle contribution to the energy current is given by

$$\mathbf{j}_\epsilon^{(1)}(1) = \left[(\nabla_2 \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{K}}_2) \widehat{\mathbf{K}}_1 - (\nabla_1 \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{K}}_1) \widehat{\mathbf{K}}_2 \right] G_{1,2}^{12} \Big|_{2 \rightarrow 1}. \quad (47)$$

Substituting all of the above results in Eq. (32a) yields

$$\frac{\partial n_E}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{j}_\epsilon^{(1)} = -\mathbf{j} \cdot \nabla U + \tilde{\Upsilon}, \quad (48)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Upsilon}_1 = & -\frac{1}{2} \int d^d r_3 V(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_3) \left\langle \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}_1, t_1) \nabla_3 \hat{\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{r}_3, t_1) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}_1, t_1) \right\rangle \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \int d^d r_3 V(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_3) \left\langle \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}_3, t_1) \nabla_1 \hat{\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{r}_1, t_1) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}_3, t_1) \right\rangle \\ & - \nabla_1 \int d^d r_3 V(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_3) \left\langle \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}_3, t_1) \hat{\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{r}_1, t_1) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}_3, t_1) \right\rangle, \end{aligned}$$

which can be re-written in a more symmetric form

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Upsilon}_1 = & -\frac{1}{2} \nabla_1 \int d^d r_3 V(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_3) \left\langle \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}_3, t_1) \hat{\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{r}_1, t_1) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}_3, t_1) \right\rangle \\ & - \frac{1}{2} \int d^d r_3 [\nabla_1 V(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_3)] \left\langle \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}_1, t_1) \hat{\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{r}_3, t_1) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}_1, t_1) \right\rangle \\ & - \frac{1}{2} \int d^d r_3 [\nabla_1 V(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_3)] \left\langle \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}_3, t_1) \hat{\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{r}_1, t_1) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}_3, t_1) \right\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

The last two terms in Eq. (49) are not gradients, but can be brought to a gradient form in the “local uniformity” approximation [24] used above in the case of momentum conservation. Repeating the steps leading to Eq. (27), I arrive at the continuity equation for the energy density (28), where the energy current is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{j}_E = & \mathbf{j}_\epsilon^{(1)} + \frac{1}{2} \int d^d r_3 V(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_3) \left\langle \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}_3, t_1) \hat{\mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{r}_1, t_1) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}_3, t_1) \right\rangle \\ & - \frac{1}{4} \int d^d r_{13} r_{13} [\nabla_{13}^i V(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_3)] \left[\left\langle \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}_1 + \mathbf{r}_{13}/2, t_1) \hat{j}^i(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_{13}/2, t_1) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}_1 + \mathbf{r}_{13}/2, t_1) \right\rangle \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \left\langle \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_{13}/2, t_1) \hat{j}^i(\mathbf{r}_1 + \mathbf{r}_{13}/2, t_1) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_{13}/2, t_1) \right\rangle \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

4.4. Summary

In this section I have derived the continuity equation for the energy density (28) from the microscopic Keldysh approach by assuming “local uniformity” within small physical volumes [24]. In that sense, the above considerations closely follow the arguments presented in the previous section. The difference here is that the resulting expression for the energy current is expressed in terms of a two-particle Green’s function. While it is possible to express the energy current in terms of the derivatives of the self-energy and the single-particle Green’s function using Eq. (3d), the resulting expression is somewhat cumbersome. At the same time, the obtained expression (50) is not immediately related to the kinetic equation since the RHS of the integrated Kadanoff-Baym equation, the quantity Υ , has to be split into the time derivative of the interaction energy and a contribution towards the energy current. This point will be discussed in the subsequent section.

5. Kinetic equation

The local continuity equations Eqs. (6), (18), and (28) expressing conservation of the number of particles, momentum, and energy, respectively can be straightforwardly obtained by integrating the Boltzmann kinetic equation [21]. As direct consequence of the conservation laws, the collision integral vanishes upon integration. In this section, I discuss the relation of this property to the identities Eqs. (16b), (24), and (40).

5.1. Kadanoff-Baym equation

Derivation of the kinetic equation is outlined in Ref. [10]. The calculation is very similar to at least some of the above considerations, with a few notable points that should be clarified here. Firstly, Ref. [10] begins with a Dyson's equation for the Keldysh function G^K instead of Eq. (3). Combining it with the conjugate equation one finds the analogue of Eq. (9), which has the form

$$\left[\left(i \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} - \hat{\mathcal{H}}_0(1) \right) + \left(i \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2} + \hat{\mathcal{H}}_0(2) \right) \right] G_{1,2}^K = \int d3 [\Sigma_{1,3}^R G_{3,2}^K + \Sigma_{1,3}^K G_{3,2}^A - G_{1,3}^R \Sigma_{3,2}^K - G_{1,3}^K \Sigma_{3,2}^A]. \quad (51)$$

Now, the Keldysh function is related to the function G^{12} by the identity

$$G^K = 2G^{12} - iA, \quad (52)$$

where A is the spectral function defined in Eq. (A.15). The choice of the Keldysh function as the “basis” function for the nonequilibrium transport theory [as opposed to G^{12} which, after all, defines the particle density, see Eq. (7)] is justified by the fact [10], that the spectral function does not depend on the state of the system and hence its contribution to macroscopic quantities out of equilibrium is irrelevant.

Although Eq. (51) is distinct from Eq. (9), it has the same property [see Eq. (11)]: the RHS of Eq. (51) vanishes in the limit $2 \rightarrow 1$. Indeed, combining Eqs. (9) and (51) according to Eq. (52), one finds the equation for the spectral function

$$\left[\left(i \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} - \hat{\mathcal{H}}_1^{(0)} \right) + \left(i \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2} + \hat{\mathcal{H}}_2^{(0)} \right) \right] A_{1,2} = \int d3 [\Sigma_{1,3}^R A_{3,2} + \Gamma_{1,3} G_{3,2}^A - G_{1,3}^R \Gamma_{3,2} - A_{1,3} \Sigma_{3,2}^A], \quad (53a)$$

where Γ defined in Eq. (A.20) is the self-energy component analogous to the spectral function. Substituting the definitions (A.15) and (A.20) into Eq. (53), one finds for the RHS

$$i \int d3 [\Sigma_{1,3}^R G_{3,2}^R - \Sigma_{1,3}^A G_{3,2}^A - G_{1,3}^R \Sigma_{3,2}^R + G_{1,3}^A \Sigma_{3,2}^A]. \quad (53b)$$

This expression vanishes in the limit $2 \rightarrow 1$, see Eq. (16d), which proves that the RHS of Eq. (51) vanishes in that limit as well.

Finally, one can re-write Eq. (51) introducing the quantities A and Γ in the RHS [10]. Introducing the short-hand notations

$$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_{12} = i \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} + i \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2} - \hat{\mathcal{H}}_1^{(0)} + \hat{\mathcal{H}}_2^{(0)}, \quad (54a)$$

$$(A \otimes B)_{1,2} = \int d3 A_{1,3} B_{3,2}, \quad (54b)$$

$$[A \circledast B]_- = A \otimes B - B \otimes A, \quad \{A \circledast B\}_+ = A \otimes B + B \otimes A, \quad (54c)$$

one arrives at the variant of the Kadanoff-Baym equation

$$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_{12} G_{1,2}^K = [\text{Re} \Sigma \circledast G^K]_- + [\Sigma^K \circledast \text{Re} G^R]_- + \frac{i}{2} \{ \Sigma^K \circledast A \}_+ - \frac{i}{2} \{ \Gamma \circledast G^K \}_+. \quad (55)$$

This equation is equivalent to Eq. (51) and hence the RHS vanishes in the limit $2 \rightarrow 1$. The RHS of the Kadanoff-Baym equation (9) can be brought to the same form as indicated above.

5.2. Kinetic equation

Let me briefly recall the standard steps of the derivation of the kinetic equation. This can be done in two different ways [10].

5.2.1. Quasiparticle and quasiclassical approximations

The first idea is to apply the gradient approximation to the Kadanoff-Baym equation (55). To do that one first introduces the Wigner representation (using the relative and center of mass coordinates introduced in section 3.4), see Appendix A. The Wigner representation is very physical, but unfortunately yields a complicated expression for the convolution, the so-called Moyal product [39]

$$A \otimes B = e^{i(\partial_\epsilon^A \partial_t^B - \nabla_{\mathbf{p}}^A \nabla_{\mathbf{r}}^B - \partial_t^A \partial_\epsilon^B + \nabla_{\mathbf{r}}^A \nabla_{\mathbf{p}}^B)} AB. \quad (56)$$

The gradient approximation in the Kadanoff-Baym equation is achieved by keeping the first two terms in the Taylor series for the exponential in Eq. (56), which yields

$$[A \otimes B]_- = i[A, B]_p, \quad \{A \otimes B\}_+ = 2AB, \quad (57)$$

where

$$[A, B]_p = (\partial_\epsilon A)(\partial_t B) - (\nabla_{\mathbf{p}} A) \cdot (\nabla_{\mathbf{r}} B) - (\partial_t A)(\partial_\epsilon B) + (\nabla_{\mathbf{r}} A) \cdot (\nabla_{\mathbf{p}} B). \quad (58)$$

Applying the above approximation to Eq. (55) one finds

$$[(\epsilon - \xi_{\mathbf{p}} - U - \text{Re}\Sigma), G^K]_p - [\Sigma^K, \text{Re}G_R]_p = \Sigma^K A - \Gamma G^K. \quad (59)$$

Here all the derivatives are combined in the LHS, while the remaining RHS can be identified with the collision integral.

The last step in the derivation is based on a further approximation. The “quasiparticle approximation” relies on the Kadanoff-Baym solution [25] for the spectral function which can be approximated by a δ -function, $A = 2\pi\delta(\epsilon - \xi_{\mathbf{p}} - U)$. Combined with the corresponding form of the Keldysh Green’s function, $G^K = -2\pi i h_{\mathbf{p}} \delta(\epsilon - \xi_{\mathbf{p}} - U)$, where $h_{\mathbf{p}}$ defines the conventional distribution function, $f_{\mathbf{p}} = (1 - h_{\mathbf{p}})/2$, one integrates Eq. (59) over ϵ and obtains the standard (Boltzmann) kinetic equation. The collision integral (up to a numerical factor) takes the form $I \propto \Sigma^K[h_{\mathbf{p}}] - (\Sigma^R - \Sigma^A)h_{\mathbf{p}}$ and is the function of \mathbf{p} , \mathbf{r} , and t . Summing over all states now amounts to integrating over the momentum variable \mathbf{p} . Given that it appears as a Fourier transform in the relative coordinate, such integration is equivalent to the limit $2 \rightarrow 1$ considered above.

Alternatively, one can integrate over $\xi_{\mathbf{p}}$ (the “quasiclassical approximation”). The idea is that in the case of, e.g., electro-phonon interaction the self-energy acquires energy dependence and hence the Kadanoff-Baym solution for the spectral function can no longer be reduced to the above δ -function. However, should the momentum dependence of the self-energy remain weak (e.g., due to the Migdal theorem [40]) the spectral function retains the form of a sharp peak in the variable $\xi_{\mathbf{p}}$. This relies on the existence of the Fermi surface: upon integration over $\xi_{\mathbf{p}}$ the Green’s functions are essentially restricted to the Fermi surface and depend only on the orientation of momentum. While the quasiclassical approximation does not explicitly require the mixed representation in the time variables, it is often invoked in order to reach the standard form of the kinetic equation [10]. The procedure becomes rather similar to the previous case and yields the same form of the collision integral, where both the self-energies and the distribution function now depend on ϵ instead of the absolute value of \mathbf{p} . Assuming the existence of quasiparticles, the two approximations can be related by the formal introduction of the density of states. At the same time, the quasiclassical approximation does not rely on the quasiparticle paradigm, which formally is expressed through the fact that the energy and momentum variables are no longer related. A known limitation of the quasiclassical approximation is its reliance on the particle-hole symmetry [10] which precludes one from describing, e.g., thermoelectric effects.

5.3. Beyond the quasiclassical approximation

The second approach to deriving the kinetic equation does not rely on the quasiparticle approximation. Instead, one introduces the *Ansatz* [10]

$$G^K = G^R \otimes h - h \otimes G^A. \quad (60)$$

Using this form in the Dyson's equation (51) and taking into account the diagonal elements of Eq. (A.11), one arrives at the equation

$$G^R \otimes \mathcal{B} - \mathcal{B} \otimes G^A = 0, \quad \mathcal{B} = \widehat{\mathcal{D}}_{12} h - [\text{Re}\Sigma \otimes h]_- + \frac{i}{2} \{ \Gamma \otimes h \}_+ + \Sigma^K. \quad (61)$$

Solving this equation to the leading order of the gradient expansion amounts to setting $\mathcal{B} = 0$ which seemingly yields the same form of the collision integral, $I \propto \Sigma^K[h] - (\Sigma^R - \Sigma^A)h$, albeit obtained without any recourse to the quasiparticle approximation. The difference is that here the “distribution function” depends not only on \mathbf{p} , \mathbf{r} , and t as in the case of the quasiclassical approximation, but also on the energy variable, i.e. $h = h(\mathbf{p}, \epsilon; \mathbf{r}, t)$. The quasiclassical (or quasiparticle) approximation allows one to integrate over ϵ using the “ δ -peak”-like form of the spectral function. The Ansatz (60) leads to the kinetic equation without any additional assumptions on the form of A .

An alternative method of deriving the quantum kinetic equation was suggested in Ref. [28] on the basis of the observation that all elements of the Keldysh Green's function matrix could be expressed in terms of two functions only, cf. Eqs. (A.4) and (A.12). Choosing the spectral function as one of the two and noticing that it becomes real in the Wigner representation, one can introduce another real function in the Wigner representation, $h = h(\mathbf{p}, \epsilon; \mathbf{r}, t)$, such that

$$G^{12}(\mathbf{p}, \epsilon; \mathbf{r}, t) = iA(\mathbf{p}, \epsilon; \mathbf{r}, t)h(\mathbf{p}, \epsilon; \mathbf{r}, t), \quad G^{21}(\mathbf{p}, \epsilon; \mathbf{r}, t) = -iA(\mathbf{p}, \epsilon; \mathbf{r}, t)[1 - h(\mathbf{p}, \epsilon; \mathbf{r}, t)]. \quad (62a)$$

This allows to use the functions A and h to express the Keldysh function G^K

$$G^K(\mathbf{p}, \epsilon; \mathbf{r}, t) = -iA(\mathbf{p}, \epsilon; \mathbf{r}, t)[1 - 2h(\mathbf{p}, \epsilon; \mathbf{r}, t)]. \quad (62b)$$

Expressing the self-energies in a similar way

$$\Sigma^{12}(\mathbf{p}, \epsilon; \mathbf{r}, t) = i\Gamma(\mathbf{p}, \epsilon; \mathbf{r}, t)\gamma(\mathbf{p}, \epsilon; \mathbf{r}, t), \quad \Sigma^{21}(\mathbf{p}, \epsilon; \mathbf{r}, t) = -i\Gamma(\mathbf{p}, \epsilon; \mathbf{r}, t)[1 - \gamma(\mathbf{p}, \epsilon; \mathbf{r}, t)], \quad (63a)$$

with

$$\Sigma^K(\mathbf{p}, \epsilon; \mathbf{r}, t) = -i\Gamma(\mathbf{p}, \epsilon; \mathbf{r}, t)[1 - 2\gamma(\mathbf{p}, \epsilon; \mathbf{r}, t)], \quad (63b)$$

one can use the new notations to re-write Eq. (55) as

$$\widehat{\mathcal{D}}Ah - [\text{Re}\Sigma \otimes Ah]_p - [\Gamma\gamma \otimes \text{Re}G^R]_p = \Gamma A(\gamma - h), \quad (64)$$

where the RHS is essentially the same form of the collision integral expressed in the new notations.

The “quantum kinetic equation” (64) was obtained within the leading order of the gradient approximation and hence provides a quantitative condition for its validity

$$|\gamma - h| \ll 1. \quad (65)$$

Consequently, in the LHS of Eq. (64) one can replace γ by h . The resulting equation corresponds to the Botermans and Malfliet [41] choice of the quantum kinetic equation (as opposed to the original Kadanoff-Baym choice). Both variants are equivalent within the applicability range of the gradient approximation.

In comparison to the Ansatz (60), the variable choice (62) reintroduces the spectral function in the definition of the distribution function h , while leaving the energy dependence of the latter. On the other hand, the choice (62) is always possible [28], while the Ansatz (60) is guaranteed to be valid only within the gradient approximation [10].

5.4. Kadanoff-Baym equation and the continuity equation

Let me now compare the derivation of the continuity equation presented in section 2 to the well-known approach of integrating the kinetic equation. Particle number conservation is manifested in the traditional kinetic theory by the fact that collision integral vanishes after being summed up over all states [21]. The quantum kinetic equation, regardless of the variant, cf. Eqs. (59), (62b). and (64), contains also the renormalization terms in the LHS. Consequently, the derivation of the kinetic equation consists of making sure that the integral of the collision term vanishes and at the same time that the renormalization terms do not affect the particle density and current [10].

In contrast, the argument presented in section 2 relies on the single identity, Eq. (11), where taking the limit $2 \rightarrow 1$ is equivalent to integrating the collision integral over all energies and momenta, ϵ and \mathbf{p} . The combination of the self-energies and Green's functions in Eq. (11) comprises both the collision integral and renormalization terms (before the gradient approximation). However, vanishing of these terms together does not in general guarantee that they should vanish individually although this does happen for most common forms of the kinetic equation [10]. The fact that renormalization does not affect the particle density follows from the operator definition, Eq. (7). Similarly, the current \mathbf{j} is determined by the operator form of the continuity equation, Eq. (8) and hence cannot be affected by interaction explicitly. This does not mean that the density and current in an interacting system are the same as in non-interacting one: both definitions involve the *exact* Green's function G^{12} , which can be very different from the free-particle one. In that sense, vanishing of the renormalization terms ensures consistency of definitions of macroscopic currents and densities in the microscopic and kinetic theories. Of course, the total number of particles is the same as in the free system since interaction does not “produce” or “destroy” any particles.

Finally, let me reiterate that the continuity equation (6) is exact as long as the interaction (and any potential) is expressed in terms of particle density, as is the case with most typical models (electron-electron Coulomb interaction, electron-phonon – or any other boson – coupling, electron-impurity scattering, etc). The purpose of the identity (11) is to make sure that any approximation made for Green's functions and self-energies does not violate the conservation law.

5.5. Kadanoff-Baym equation and momentum conservation

The continuity equation for momentum density (18) is the central equation in the hydrodynamic theory eventually yielding the Euler and Navier-Stokes equations. In contrast to the continuity equation (6), the equation (18) is not exact, but is valid within the gradient approximation. This is not a problem, since hydrodynamics describes long-wavelength variations of macroscopic quantities. The same gradient approximation is used to derive the kinetic equation. The equation (18) can then be obtained by multiplying the kinetic equation by momentum and summing over all states without further approximations. As a result of this procedure the RHS (i.e., the collision integral) of the kinetic equation vanishes which is the manifestation of momentum conservation [21].

Microscopically, momentum conservation is manifested through the identity (24). This directly leads to vanishing of the quantity \mathbf{C} integrated over all space and hence to the global (integral) relation (21). The quantity \mathbf{C} itself emerges from the RHS of the Kadanoff-Baym equation in the limit $2 \rightarrow 1$ which is equivalent of integrating the RHS of the quantum kinetic equation. The gradient approximation used to derive Eq. (18) is equivalent to the one needed to derive the quantum kinetic equation. In particular, separating the integrand \mathbf{c}_+ into two parts corresponds to the distinction between the collision integral and the renormalization terms in Eqs. (59) and (64). In this case it can be seen directly that the integrated collision integral vanishes while the renormalization terms contribute to the momentum flux tensor, see Eq. (27). The momentum density \mathbf{g} is determined by the momentum operator, see Eq. (19), and hence is unaffected by renormalizations similarly to the particle number density and current. The derivation presented in Sec. 3 is thus equivalent to the more standard route of going through the kinetic equation (either the Boltzmann one or quantum), but has the advantage of being free of any additional approximation beyond the gradient expansion. Taking into account additional interaction that do not conserve momentum amounts to evaluating its contribution to the quantity \mathbf{C} in the “0-th” approximation with respect to the gradients, which is equivalent to evaluating the corresponding collision integral.

5.6. Kadanoff-Baym equation and energy conservation

Energy conservation is the most difficult part of the presented approach since the energy density at the operator level is essentially a two-particle correlation function. Global energy conservation can be expressed in terms of the integral relation (33). As in the case of momentum conservation, the RHS of the Kadanoff-Baym equation in the limit $2 \rightarrow 1$, i.e., the quantity Υ , determines the time derivative of the interaction energy upon being integrated over all space. However, now both the energy density and current are renormalized by interaction. Separating the time derivative of the interaction energy density from Υ leaves the contribution to the energy current that has to be combined with the interaction contribution to the “single-particle” current \mathcal{J} . This should be contrasted with the standard kinetic theory derivation [2, 8, 21] where a direct integration of the kinetic equation multiplied by energy yields the energy density and current from the LHS, while the collision integral vanishes. At the same time, the “internal energy” appears through thermodynamic identities [21]. This apparent complication in comparing the two approaches is reminiscent of the common practice in conventional hydrodynamics where dissipative processes are taken into account using the entropy flow equation rather than the continuity equation for the energy density [20, 21]. The entropy flow equation will be discussed in a forthcoming publication [42].

Recent literature on electronic hydrodynamics in graphene [2–4, 8] devotes little attention to the internal energy. The role of electron-electron interaction is seen as being responsible for equilibration, although in real materials equilibration is most likely to occur with the help of phonons. Taking into account electron-phonon interaction leading to energy relaxation [31] would violate the identity (24). In the simplest case (cf. the arguments of Ref. [31]), one would have to evaluate the phonon contribution to Υ establishing the weak decay contribution to the continuity equation (28).

6. Discussion

In this paper I have presented a detailed derivation of the local continuity equations providing the basis of the hydrodynamic theory of electronic transport. While the continuity equation manifesting gauge invariance is exact, the corresponding equations for the momentum and energy density are obtained within the gradient approximation. The presented derivation is more general than the kinetic theory approach since it relies neither on additional approximations (such as the common quasiparticle or quasiclassical approximations) nor on the concept of the distribution function. Although the latter can be introduced at the quantum level [e.g., by Eqs. (60) or (62)], it is not always obvious how to generalize this quantity to more complicated cases, e.g., involving spin-orbit interaction. Keeping the discussion in coordinate space allows for a direct generalization for systems in confined geometries.

The idea that hydrodynamics is “more general” than the kinetic theory is not new and can be already seen in the original hydrodynamic description of conventional fluids (none of which could be described by a kinetic equation). Microscopic expressions for the momentum flux tensor, interaction energy density, and energy current presented here open a direct pathway for evaluating these quantities using specific models of the systems of interest. In particular, there is already a substantial literature on hydrodynamic approach to “strange” or “bad” metals [43–47], where the excitation spectrum might not contain usual quasiparticles, as could be seen in photoemission [48] and transport [49] experiments. Some of these materials exhibit resistance that is linear in temperature over a wide range including both low and high temperatures [50], the behavior that has been puzzling the community for decades. The analysis presented here could be seen as a way of evaluating resistivity directly (similarly to the case of graphene [2–4]) without the need for a Kubo formula and may prove helpful for describing less established systems such as “non-Fermi liquids”.

Finally, supplementing the continuity equations by the constitutive relations one arrives at the hydrodynamic theory. The constitutive relations are typically formulated either on symmetry grounds [20] or on the basis of the kinetic theory [2, 8, 21]. In the latter case one associates the ideal flow with local equilibrium. All macroscopic quantities (the densities, currents, and stress tensor) can be straightforwardly evaluated by substituting the explicit form of the local equilibrium distribution function into their respective definitions. Dissipation is taken into account perturbatively insofar the dissipative corrections are expressed within the leading order in the gradient expansion. The particular form of the dissipative corrections is dictated by

symmetry leaving a small number of coefficients (in the usual hydrodynamics the three coefficients are the shear and bulk viscosities and thermal conductivity) to be determined either by solving the kinetic equation or phenomenologically.

In the present approach the macroscopic quantities are expressed in terms of the exact Green's functions. The expression for the fluid velocity in terms of the Keldysh Green's functions was given in Ref. [51]. Since the general form of the dissipative corrections is independent of the microscopic derivation, one needs to expand Eqs. (10), (27), and (50) in terms of the velocity gradients and hence determine the dissipative coefficients (the viscosity, electrical and thermal conductivities). If the calculation is done perturbatively, then the results are going to coincide with those done within the kinetic approach (the diagrammatic perturbative expansion is identical with the kinetic theory [11]). However, if there are no quasiparticles in the system such that the kinetic theory breaks down, the presented approach still offers a straightforward way to evaluate the kinetic coefficients. Alternatively, one can treat the coefficients purely phenomenologically while using the hydrodynamic equations to determine the spatial distribution of the charge and energy flows.

Acknowledgments

The author wishes to thank I.V. Aleiner, I.V. Gornyi, A.D. Mirlin, J. Schmalian, and A. Shnirman for fruitful discussions. This work was supported by the German Research Foundation DFG project NA 1114/5-1 and the European Commission under the EU Horizon 2020 MSCA-RISE-2019 Program (Project 873028 HYDROTRONICS).

Appendix A. Non-equilibrium (or Keldysh) Green's function formalism

Here I summarize the notations for the Keldysh Green's functions and their standard relations to keep the paper self-complete. For a detailed account of the Keldysh technique see Refs. [10, 23].

Appendix A.1. Keldysh Green's function

The central quantity of the formalism is the Green's function that can be defined either in the Heisenberg (subscript "H") or "interaction (subscript "I") representation on the Keldysh contour (subscript "C")

$$G(1_C, 2_C) = -i \langle \mathcal{T}_C \hat{\psi}_H(1_C) \hat{\psi}_H^\dagger(2_C) \rangle = -i \langle \mathcal{T}_C \hat{\mathcal{S}}_C \hat{\psi}_I(1_C) \hat{\psi}_I^\dagger(2_C) \rangle, \quad (\text{A.1a})$$

where the latter expression retains only the "connected" diagrams. In Eq. (A.1), \mathcal{T}_C is the time-ordering operator on the Keldysh contour and the "scattering matrix" is

$$\hat{\mathcal{S}}_C = \mathcal{T}_C \exp \left[-i \int_C dt_C \hat{H}_{\text{int}}(t_C) \right]. \quad (\text{A.1b})$$

The Green's function (A.1) can be more conveniently described in the matrix form

$$\check{G}_{1,2} = \begin{pmatrix} G_{1,2}^{11} & G_{1,2}^{12} \\ G_{1,2}^{21} & G_{1,2}^{22} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where

$$G_{1,2}^{12} = i \langle \hat{\psi}_H^\dagger(2) \hat{\psi}_H(1) \rangle, \quad (\text{A.3a})$$

$$G_{1,2}^{21} = -i \langle \hat{\psi}_H(1) \hat{\psi}_H^\dagger(2) \rangle, \quad (\text{A.3b})$$

$$G_{1,2}^{11} = \theta(t_1 - t_2) G_{1,2}^{21} + \theta(t_2 - t_1) G_{1,2}^{12}, \quad (\text{A.3c})$$

$$G_{1,2}^{22} = \theta(t_1 - t_2) G_{1,2}^{11} + \theta(t_2 - t_1) G_{1,2}^{21}. \quad (\text{A.3d})$$

The four matrix elements are not independent and satisfy

$$\check{G}_{1,2} = -\check{\tau}_1 \check{G}_{2,1}^\dagger \check{\tau}_1, \quad \text{Tr } \check{G}_{1,2} = \text{Tr } \check{\tau}_1 \check{G}_{1,2}, \quad (\text{A.4a})$$

where $\check{\tau}_i$ are the Pauli matrices in the “Keldysh space”. Explicitly, the later relation takes the form

$$G_{1,2}^{11} + G_{1,2}^{22} = G_{1,2}^{12} + G_{1,2}^{21}. \quad (\text{A.4b})$$

Appendix A.2. Self-energy

The Green’s function obeys the formally exact Dyson’s equation

$$\left(i \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} - \hat{\mathcal{H}}_1^{(0)} \right) \check{G}_{1,2} - \int d3 \check{\Sigma}_{1,3} \check{\tau}_3 \check{G}_{3,2} = \check{\tau}_3 \delta_{1,2}, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

where the self-energy is the matrix

$$\check{\Sigma}_{1,2} = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{1,2}^{11} & \Sigma_{1,2}^{12} \\ \Sigma_{1,2}^{21} & \Sigma_{1,2}^{22} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

The above definition differs from that in Ref. [21], where the Pauli matrix in the integral in Eq. (A.5) precedes the self-energy [21]. This amounts to the replacement

$$\check{\Sigma}_{1,2} \rightarrow \check{\tau}_3 \check{\Sigma}_{1,2} \check{\tau}_3,$$

or simply put, the extra minus sign for the off-diagonal elements. This can be made clearer by transforming the integro-differential equation (A.5) to the integral form using the “free” Green’s function

$$\check{G}_{1,2}^{(0)} = \left(i \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} - \hat{\mathcal{H}}_1^{(0)} \right)^{-1} \check{\tau}_3 \delta_{1,2}. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Applying the operator $\left(i \partial_{t_1} - \hat{\mathcal{H}}_1^{(0)} \right)^{-1}$ to Eq. (A.5) from the left, one finds

$$\check{G}_{1,2} - \int d3 d4 \check{G}_{1,4}^{(0)} \check{\tau}_3 \check{\Sigma}_{4,3} \check{\tau}_3 \check{G}_{3,2} = \check{G}_{1,2}^{(0)}, \quad (\text{A.8})$$

in contrast to the corresponding equation in Ref. [21] where there are no Pauli matrices.

The rationale for the above notation is as follows. The self-energy has the same “symmetry” as the Green’s function, see Eq. (A.4)

$$\check{\Sigma}_{1,2} = -\check{\tau}_1 \check{\Sigma}_{2,1}^\dagger \check{\tau}_1, \quad \text{Tr } \check{\Sigma}_{1,2} = \text{Tr } \check{\tau}_1 \check{\Sigma}_{1,2}. \quad (\text{A.9a})$$

The latter relation reads

$$\Sigma_{1,2}^{11} + \Sigma_{1,2}^{22} = \Sigma_{1,2}^{12} + \Sigma_{1,2}^{21}, \quad (\text{A.9b})$$

similarly to Eq. (A.4b) and without the extra minus sign in the right-hand side as in Ref. [21].

Appendix A.3. Keldysh rotation

One may try to use the relations (A.4) to reduce the number of Green’s functions. This can be achieved by a “rotation” [10, 52]

$$\check{G}_{1,2} \rightarrow \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \check{\tau}_3 \check{G}_{1,2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{A.10a})$$

In the new basis, both the Green’s function and self-energy have the similar form (unlike the form suggested in Ref. [21])

$$\check{G} = \begin{pmatrix} G^R & G^K \\ 0 & G^A \end{pmatrix}, \quad \check{\Sigma} = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma^R & \Sigma^K \\ 0 & \Sigma^A \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{A.10b})$$

In terms of the original Green's functions, the newly defined functions are given by

$$\begin{aligned} G^R &= G^{11} - G^{12} = G^{21} - G^{22} = \theta(t_1 - t_2) [G_{1,2}^{21} - G_{1,2}^{12}], \\ G^A &= G^{11} - G^{21} = G^{12} - G^{22} = -\theta(t_2 - t_1) [G_{1,2}^{21} - G_{1,2}^{12}], \\ G^K &= G^{12} + G^{21} = G^{11} + G^{22}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.10c})$$

In the rotated basis, the Dyson's equation takes the form (same as in Ref. [21])

$$\left(i \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} - \hat{\mathcal{H}}_1^{(0)}\right) \check{G}_{1,2} - \int d3 \check{\Sigma}_{1,3} \check{G}_{3,2} = \delta_{1,2}. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

The basis rotation does not completely eliminate the redundancy in the definitions of the Green's function. Indeed, the Green's function in the rotated basis satisfies [cf. Eq. (A.4)]

$$\check{G}_{1,2} = \check{\tau}_2 \check{G}_{2,1}^\dagger \check{\tau}_2, \quad (\text{A.12})$$

with the similar constraint on the self-energy [cf. Eq. (A.9)]

$$\check{\Sigma}_{1,2} = \check{\tau}_2 \check{\Sigma}_{2,1}^\dagger \check{\tau}_2. \quad (\text{A.13})$$

As a result, only two functions in either matrix are independent.

Suppose one chooses $G_{1,2}^{12}$ and $G_{1,2}^{21}$ as such independent functions. Then from Eq. (A.4) it follows that they have the following property

$$[G_{1,2}^{12}]^* = -G_{2,1}^{12}, \quad [G_{1,2}^{21}]^* = -G_{2,1}^{21}. \quad (\text{A.14})$$

Consider then their difference

$$A_{1,2} = i [G_{1,2}^{21} - G_{1,2}^{12}] = i [G_{1,2}^R - G_{1,2}^A]. \quad (\text{A.15a})$$

As follows from the symmetry of the Green's functions, Eq. (A.14), the new function satisfies

$$A_{1,2}^* = A_{2,1}. \quad (\text{A.15b})$$

Appendix A.4. Wigner representation

The gradient approximation needed to derive quantum kinetic equations is most readily demonstrated in the mixed or Wigner representation, i.e. the Fourier representation in the relative coordinate (the relative and center of mass coordinates were introduced in section 3.4)

$$A(\mathbf{p}, \epsilon; \mathbf{R}_{12}, T_{12}) = \int d^d r_{12} dt_{12} A_{1,2} e^{-i(\mathbf{p} \mathbf{r}_{12} - \epsilon t_{12})}, \quad (\text{A.16})$$

where $t_{12} = t_1 - t_2$ and $T_{12} = (t_1 + t_2)/2$.

In the Wigner representation, the spectral function A is real [cf. Eq. (A.15b)] and satisfies the “sum rule”

$$A^*(\mathbf{p}, \epsilon; \mathbf{r}, t) = A(\mathbf{p}, \epsilon; \mathbf{r}, t), \quad \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\epsilon}{2\pi} A(\mathbf{p}, \epsilon; \mathbf{r}, t) = 1. \quad (\text{A.17})$$

At the same time, it completely determines the retarded and advanced functions through the relation

$$G^R(\mathbf{p}, \epsilon; \mathbf{r}, t) = [G^A(\mathbf{p}, \epsilon; \mathbf{r}, t)]^* = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\epsilon'}{2\pi} \frac{A(\mathbf{p}, \epsilon'; \mathbf{r}, t)}{\epsilon - \epsilon' + i0^+}, \quad (\text{A.18})$$

where $(\epsilon + i0^+)^{-1}$ is the Fourier transform of the θ -function in Eq. (A.10c). As a result, one may express these function as

$$G^{R(A)} = \text{Re } G^R \mp \frac{i}{2} A. \quad (\text{A.19})$$

Similar relations can be defined for the self-energy. Defining the analogue of the spectral function

$$\Gamma_{1,2} = i [\Sigma_{1,2}^R - \Sigma_{1,2}^A], \quad (\text{A.20})$$

one finds in the Wigner representation

$$\Sigma^{R(A)} = \text{Re} \Sigma \mp \frac{i}{2} \Gamma. \quad (\text{A.21})$$

References

- [1] M. Polini, A. K. Geim, Viscous electron fluids, *Phys. Today* 73 (6) (2020) 28–34. doi:10.1063/PT.3.4497.
- [2] B. N. Narozhny, Hydrodynamic approach to two-dimensional electron systems, *Riv. Nuovo Cim.* 45 (2022) 661–736. doi:10.1007/s40766-022-00036-z.
- [3] A. Lucas, K. C. Fong, Hydrodynamics of electrons in graphene, *J. Phys: Condens. Matter* 30 (5) (2018) 053001. doi:10.1088/1361-648x/aaa274.
- [4] B. N. Narozhny, I. V. Gornyi, A. D. Mirlin, J. Schmalian, Hydrodynamic Approach to Electronic Transport in Graphene, *Annalen der Physik* 529 (11) (2017) 1700043. doi:10.1002/andp.201700043.
- [5] R. N. Gurzhi, Hydrodynamic Effects in Solids At Low Temperature, *Soviet Physics Uspekhi* 11 (2) (1968) 255–270, [*Usp. Fiz. Nauk* 94, 689 (1968)]. doi:10.1070/PU1968v011n02ABEH003815.
- [6] L. S. Levitov, G. Falkovich, Electron viscosity, current vortices and negative nonlocal resistance in graphene, *Nat. Phys.* 12 (7) (2016) 672–676. doi:10.1038/nphys3667.
- [7] M. Shavit, A. V. Shytov, G. Falkovich, Freely flowing currents and electric field expulsion in viscous electronics, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 123 (2019) 026801. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.123.026801.
- [8] B. N. Narozhny, Electronic hydrodynamics in graphene, *Ann. Phys.* 411 (2019) 167979. doi:10.1016/j.aop.2019.167979.
- [9] P. M. Chaikin, T. C. Lubensky, *Principles of Condensed Matter Physics*, Cambridge University Press, 1995. doi:10.1017/CB09780511813467.
- [10] J. Rammer, H. Smith, Quantum field-theoretical methods in transport theory of metals, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 58 (1986) 323–359. doi:10.1103/RevModPhys.58.323.
- [11] G. Zala, B. N. Narozhny, I. L. Aleiner, Interaction corrections at intermediate temperatures: Longitudinal conductivity and kinetic equation, *Phys. Rev. B* 64 (2001) 214204. doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.64.214204.
- [12] P. A. Lee, T. V. Ramakrishnan, Disordered electronic systems, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 57 (1985) 287–337. doi:10.1103/RevModPhys.57.287.
- [13] B. L. Altshuler, A. G. Aronov, Electron-Electron Interaction In Disordered Conductor, in: A. L. Efros, M. Pollak (Eds.), *Electron-Electron Interactions in Disordered Systems*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1985, p. 1. doi:10.1016/B978-0-444-86916-6.50007-7.
- [14] B. N. Narozhny, M. Schütt, Magnetohydrodynamics in graphene: Shear and hall viscosities, *Phys. Rev. B* 100 (2019) 035125. doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.100.035125.
- [15] B. Keimer, S. A. Kivelson, M. R. Norman, S. Uchida, J. Zaanen, From quantum matter to high-temperature superconductivity in copper oxides, *Nature* 518 (2015) 179–186. doi:10.1038/nature14165.
- [16] M. Auslender, M. I. Katsnelson, Generalized kinetic equations for charge carriers in graphene, *Phys. Rev. B* 76 (2007) 235425. doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.76.235425.
- [17] C. L. Navier, Mémoire sur les lois du mouvement des fluides, in: *Mémoires de l’Académie des sciences de l’Institut de France - Année 1823*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, 1827, pp. 389–440.
- [18] G. G. Stokes, On the theories of the internal friction of fluids in motion and of the equilibrium and motion of elastic solids, *Transactions of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* 8 (1845) 287.
- [19] G. G. Stokes, On the effect of the internal friction of fluids on the motion of pendulums, *Transactions of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* 9 (1851) 8.
- [20] L. D. Landau, E. M. Lifshitz, *Fluid Mechanics*, Pergamon Press, London, 1987. doi:10.1016/C2013-0-03799-1.
- [21] E. M. Lifshitz, L. P. Pitaevskii, *Physical Kinetics*, Pergamon Press, London, 1981. doi:10.1016/C2009-0-25523-1.
- [22] B. N. Narozhny, I. L. Aleiner, A. Stern, Mesoscopic fluctuations of the Coulomb drag at $\nu = 1/2$, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 86 (2001) 3610–3613. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.86.3610.
- [23] A. Kamenev, *Field Theory of Non-Equilibrium Systems*, Cambridge University Press, 2011. doi:10.1017/CB09781139003667.
- [24] P. C. Martin, J. Schwinger, Theory of Many-Particle Systems. I, *Phys. Rev.* 115 (1959) 1342–1373. doi:10.1103/PhysRev.115.1342.
- [25] G. Baym, L. P. Kadanoff, Conservation laws and correlation functions, *Phys. Rev.* 124 (1961) 287–299. doi:10.1103/PhysRev.124.287.
- [26] G. Baym, Self-consistent approximations in many-body systems, *Phys. Rev.* 127 (1962) 1391–1401. doi:10.1103/PhysRev.127.1391.

- [27] Y. Ivanov, J. Knoll, D. Voskresensky, Self-consistent approximations to non-equilibrium many-body theory, *Nuclear Physics A* 657 (4) (1999) 413–445. doi:10.1016/S0375-9474(99)00313-9.
- [28] Y. Ivanov, J. Knoll, D. Voskresensky, Resonance transport and kinetic entropy, *Nuclear Physics A* 672 (1) (2000) 313–356. doi:10.1016/S0375-9474(99)00559-X.
- [29] J. Knoll, Y. Ivanov, D. Voskresensky, Exact Conservation Laws of the Gradient Expanded Kadanoff–Baym Equations, *Annals of Physics* 293 (2) (2001) 126–146. doi:10.1006/aphy.2001.6185.
- [30] B. N. Narozhny, I. V. Gornyi, M. Titov, M. Schütt, A. D. Mirlin, Hydrodynamics in graphene: Linear-response transport, *Phys. Rev. B* 91 (2015) 035414. doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.91.035414.
- [31] B. N. Narozhny, I. V. Gornyi, Hydrodynamic approach to electronic transport in graphene: energy relaxation, *Frontiers in Physics* 9 (2021) 108. doi:10.3389/fphy.2021.640649.
- [32] L. D. Landau, E. M. Lifshitz, *Classical Theory of Fields*, 4th Ed., Pergamon Press, London, 2013.
- [33] C. Itzykson, J. Zuber, *Quantum Field Theory*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1988.
- [34] B. Bradlyn, M. Goldstein, N. Read, Kubo formulas for viscosity: Hall viscosity, ward identities, and the relation with conductivity, *Phys. Rev. B* 86 (2012) 245309. doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.86.245309.
- [35] P. Rao, B. Bradlyn, Hall viscosity in quantum systems with discrete symmetry: Point group and lattice anisotropy, *Phys. Rev. X* 10 (2020) 021005. doi:10.1103/PhysRevX.10.021005.
- [36] A. Principi, G. Vignale, M. Carrega, M. Polini, Bulk and shear viscosities of the two-dimensional electron liquid in a doped graphene sheet, *Phys. Rev. B* 93 (2016) 125410. doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.93.125410.
- [37] J. M. Link, D. E. Sheehy, B. N. Narozhny, J. Schmalian, Elastic response of the electron fluid in intrinsic graphene: The collisionless regime, *Phys. Rev. B* 98 (2018) 195103. doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.98.195103.
- [38] M. I. Katsnelson, *Graphene*, Cambridge University Press, 2012. doi:10.1017/CB09781139031080.
- [39] J. E. Moyal, Quantum mechanics as a statistical theory, *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* 45 (1949) 99–124. doi:10.1017/S0305004100000487.
- [40] A. B. Migdal, Interaction between Electrons and Lattice Vibrations in a Normal Metal, *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* 34 (1958) 1438, [*Sov. Phys. JETP* 7, 996 (1958)].
- [41] W. Botermans, R. Malfliet, Quantum transport theory of nuclear matter, *Physics Reports* 198 (3) (1990) 115–194. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-1573(90)90174-Z.
- [42] B. N. Narozhny (2023).
- [43] R. A. Davison, K. Schalm, J. Zaanen, Holographic duality and the resistivity of strange metals, *Phys. Rev. B* 89 (2014) 245116. doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.89.245116.
- [44] A. Legros, S. Benhabib, W. Tabis, F. Laliberté, M. Dion, M. Lizaire, B. Vignolle, D. Vignolles, H. Raffy, Z. Z. Li, P. Auban-Senzier, N. Doiron-Leyraud, P. Fournier, D. Colson, L. Taillefer, C. Proust, Universal T-linear resistivity and Planckian dissipation in overdoped cuprates, *Nat. Phys.* 15 (2) (2019) 142–147. doi:10.1038/s41567-018-0334-2.
- [45] S. A. Hartnoll, Theory of universal incoherent metallic transport, *Nat. Phys.* 11 (1) (2015) 54–61. doi:10.1038/nphys3174.
- [46] J. Erdmenger, I. Matthaïakakis, R. Meyer, D. R. Fernández, Strongly coupled electron fluids in the poiseuille regime, *Phys. Rev. B* 98 (2018) 195143. doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.98.195143.
- [47] J. Zaanen, Planckian dissipation, minimal viscosity and the transport in cuprate strange metals, *SciPost Phys.* 6 (5) (2019) 061. doi:10.21468/SciPostPhys.6.5.061.
- [48] A. Damascelli, Z. Hussain, Z.-X. Shen, Angle-resolved photoemission studies of the cuprate superconductors, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 75 (2003) 473–541. doi:10.1103/RevModPhys.75.473.
- [49] J. Ayres, M. Berben, M. Culo, Y.-T. Hsu, E. van Heumen, Y. Huang, J. Zaanen, T. Kondo, T. Takeuchi, J. R. Cooper, C. Putzke, S. Friedemann, A. Carrington, N. E. Hussey, Incoherent transport across the strange-metal regime of overdoped cuprates, *Nature* 595 (2021) 661–666. doi:10.1038/s41586-021-03622-z.
- [50] J. A. N. Bruin, H. Sakai, R. S. Perry, A. P. Mackenzie, Similarity of Scattering Rates in Metals Showing T-Linear Resistivity, *Science* 339 (6121) (2013) 804–807. doi:10.1126/science.1227612.
- [51] I. L. Aleiner, O. Agam, Saturation of strong electron–electron umklapp scattering at high temperature, *Ann. Phys.* 385 (2017) 716–728. doi:10.1016/j.aop.2017.08.017.
- [52] A. I. Larkin, Y. N. Ovchinnikov, Nonlinear conductivity of superconductors in the mixed state, *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* 68 (1975) 1915, [*Sov. Phys. JETP* 41, 960 (1975)].