

Relativistic Model of two-band Superconductivity in (2+1)-dimension

Tadafumi Ohsaku

Department of Physics, and Department of Chemistry,
Graduate School of Science, Osaka University, Toyonaka,
Osaka, Japan, and Research Center for Nuclear Physics,
Osaka University, Ibaraki, Osaka, Japan,
and Yukawa Institute for Theoretical Physics, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan.

(Dated: April 14, 2024)

Abstract

We investigate the relativistic model of superconductivity in (2+1)-dimension. We employ the massless Gross-Neveu model at finite temperature and density, to study the superconductivity and superconducting instability. Our investigation is related to the superconductivity in (2+1)-dimensional two-band systems like MgB_2 or intercalated graphite.

PACS numbers: PACS: 11.10.-z, 11.10.Kk, 74.20.Fg, 74.20.Rp

I. INTRODUCTION

Condensed matter physics in low-dimension is an interesting research area both experimentally and theoretically [1]. For example, the discovery of the high- T_c superconductors made a large impact on condensed matter physics, and in such systems, the superconductivity is considered to occur in a quasi-two-space-dimensional copper oxide CuO_2 plane [2-7]. The recent discovery of the superconductivity in MgB_2 was also a quite important event [8], and people expect that a plane constructed by B atoms plays the main role in the superconductivity. Graphite and carbon nanotube also attract our attention, and they are plane systems [9]. Therefore, the superconductivity in two-dimensional systems is of prime importance, and well recognized in condensed matter physics. In the theoretical side, Aoki et al. studied the effect of the dimensionality [10], the effect of band structures [11], the multiband effect (two-band model [12], four-band model [13]) and the effect of shapes of the Fermi surfaces [14], in superconductivity of several systems (see also Ref. 15 for two-band model and Ref. 16 for three-band model). The keywords of recent theoretical investigation into superconductivity are "two-space-dimensional" and "two-band."

The two-band models of superconductivity [17-28] have the origin in the papers of Suhl, Matthias and Walker [17], and Kondo [18,19], and they were applied to several systems under various situations. Both MgB_2 and graphite have honeycomb lattice structure, and essentially they are two-band systems. Quite recently, a theoretical study of two-band superconductivity in MgB_2 appeared [22-24]. The experimental evidence for two-band superconductivity in MgB_2 was also obtained [29]. Some relations between superconductivity and excitonic state (exciton condensed state) in two-band models were also examined [25,26]. Low-energy effective theories for two-band superconductivity similar to the Ginzburg-Landau model were proposed [27,28]. Some theoreticians consider that the copper oxide high- T_c superconductor can also be described by a two-band theory (the d-p model) [3,4]. Today, much attentions are paid for two-band superconductivity. There are various two-band models for superconductivity. For example, Suhl et al. used the model which has only an attractive interaction between particles in a two-band system [17]. Yamaji discussed a pairing problem by an interband polarization function arising from a repulsive interaction [20]. Kondo found that a kind of two-band effect enhances the superconductivity [18]. However, until now, it is not clear how much is the contribution of the lower band.

There is no quantitative understanding about the strength of the two-band effect, especially the lower-band effect.

Relativistic fermion often appears in condensed matter systems [30–36]. Semenoff studied the (2+1)-dimensional (2 for space and 1 for time) relativistic fermion model in graphite. Based on the character of (2+1)-dimensional relativistic quantum field theory [37–41], he discussed the anomaly (the Chern-Simons term and the fractional fermion number) [30]. As a consequence of the honeycomb lattice structure of graphite, its band structure has two degeneracy points in the first Brillouin zone (two conical intersections between the upper band and lower band). Then the relativistic fermion model is obtained in the linear dispersion approximation [30–34]:

$$H = v_F \gamma^0 (\gamma^1 p_x + \gamma^2 p_y) \quad (1)$$

(as illustrated in Figs. 1 and 2). Here, v_F is the Fermi velocity, and p_x and p_y are momentum operators. By using the Dirac fermion model with a Coulomb repulsion, Gonzalez et al. concluded that the superconductivity can emerge in graphite [32]. Shankar derived a Dirac fermion model in (2+1)-dimensional doped antiferromagnets [35]. Because those relativistic models have two bands (positive and negative energy states), they can provide powerful techniques to study the low-energy and long-wavelength properties of (2+1)-dimensional two-band systems.

With these considerations given above, we investigate the relativistic model of two-band superconductivity in (2+1)-dimension. The purposes of this paper is to examine a two-band effect in superconductivity in the (2+1)-dimensional system. We concentrate on the examination of the effect of the lower band, by extracting the strength of its contribution in the superconductivity. In real substances, our theory can be applied to systems which have two-space-dimensional honeycomb lattice structure like MgB_2 , electron-doped-graphite and graphite intercalation compounds (LiC_6 , KC_8 , etc.), or to systems of the kagome lattice structure [42]. Because real substances are not exactly (2+1)-dimensional, we do not consider the Kosterlitz-Thouless transition in two-space-dimensional superconductivity seriously [43].

This paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we introduce the Gross-Neveu model as our model Lagrangian, and discuss its characteristic aspects. By using this model Lagrangian, we study the superconductivity, namely, one of the phenomena of dynamical $U(1)$ -gauge-symmetry breaking in (2+1)-dimension. In Sec. III, the Gor'kov formalism [44] for a

contact attractive interaction in our theory is presented. In Sec. IV, the group-theoretical consideration of the mean fields (gap functions) is provided. In Sec. V, by using the Gor'kov formalism, the gap equations in our theory are derived, and they are solved numerically. In 1965, Kohn and Luttinger proved that, whether a two-body interaction is attractive or repulsive, there is a Cooper instability in an interacting many-fermion system (the Kohn-Luttinger effect) [45]. Shankar and Chubukov independently proved the existence of the Kohn-Luttinger (KL) effect in a two-space-dimensional system [46,47]. In Sec. VI, for the pairing problem in the case of a repulsive interaction, the KL effect in our theory is examined by using the Bethe-Salpeter (BS) formalism. Finally in Sec VII, we give the conclusion of this work, with further possible investigation in our theory.

II. THE MODEL LAGRANGIAN AND HAMILTONIAN

In this section, we discuss the character of the model Lagrangian to study the (2+1)-dimensional relativistic superconductivity. We take the following Lagrangian for the starting point:

$$\mathcal{L}(\psi) = \bar{\psi}(x) i \not{\partial} \psi(x) + \frac{G}{2} (\bar{\psi}(x) \psi(x))^2 : \quad (2)$$

This is the (2+1)-dimensional Gross-Neveu model [48-52]. The first term is the kinetic term of the Dirac field, and ψ and $\bar{\psi}$ are the two-component relativistic spinors describing the Dirac fields. Here, we do not give a mass to the fermion. It is well known in (2+1)-dimensional relativistic field theory [37-41], the Dirac mass term $m \bar{\psi} \psi$ violates both the parity and the time reversal symmetries. As discussed in the introduction, we treat the system which has a degeneracy point at zero momentum. We have to consider the massless case. In Eq. (2), we introduce the four-body contact interaction at the same spacetime point. Here, we consider one of the simplest relativistic interaction which may generate a superconductivity. When $G > 0$, it will give an attractive interaction. We set aside the question of the origin of the attractive interaction, and regard the Lagrangian (2) as a phenomenological one. On the other hand, when $G < 0$, it will become a similar interaction to the on-site repulsion of the Hubbard model in its continuum limit. If we employ naive power counting analysis, we find that the theory is unrenormalizable and we have to introduce a cutoff. Until now, the (2+1)-dimensional Gross-Neveu model is studied extensively, especially in the context of the

dynamical chiral symmetry breaking [48-52]. Rosenstein et al. treated the model by using the $1/N$ expansion (here, N is a number of flavor) [49]. The method of $1/N$ expansion, a kind of mean-field theory, treats the sum of an infinite number of Feynman diagrams similar to the Hartree-Fock theory. Rosenstein et al. also gave a proof of renormalizability of the model under the $1/N$ expansion. On the other hand, we study a subset of diagrams different from that of Rosenstein et al. In fact, Rosenstein et al. investigated the chiral symmetry breaking arising from fermion-antifermion condensate $\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle \neq 0$, while we treat a fermion-fermion pairing problem, $\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle = 0$. In other words, Rosenstein et al. studied the dynamical generation of Dirac mass, while we study the dynamical generation of Majorana-type mass. In this paper, we will not study the possibility of renormalizability of our theory, and treat ultraviolet divergences with a simple cutoff scheme. The cutoff indicates the momentum range appropriate to the linear dispersion approximation. Our Lagrangian should be regarded as a model in this range of momentum space. For the purpose of this paper, we do not have to introduce the constant for the Fermi velocity v_F in the model. Equation (2) itself has symmetries of Poincare invariance, $U(1)$ -gauge invariance, charge conjugation invariance, spatial inversion and time reversal invariance.

For the Clifford algebra [37,38] of γ -matrices, using the Pauli matrices:

$$\gamma^0 = \sigma^3; \quad \gamma^1 = i\sigma^1; \quad \gamma^2 = i\sigma^2; \quad (3)$$

(here the chirality $\frac{i}{2}\text{tr} \gamma^0 \gamma^1 \gamma^2 = +1$) we obtain the next relations:

$$\{f, g\} = 2g; \quad \gamma^0 = \sigma^0; \quad \gamma^i = g \sigma^i g^{-1}; \quad (4)$$

Here, $\sigma^{012} = 1$. We take the metric convention as $g = \text{diag}(1; -1; -1)$. The charge conjugation matrix is given as

$$C^{-1} C = \gamma^0; \quad C^\dagger C = 1; \quad (5)$$

For the Poincare algebra, the generator of the Lorentz transformation satisfies the $SO(2;1)$ algebra:

$$[j^i; j^j] = i g^{ij}; \quad (6)$$

where j^0 is the generator of two-dimensional rotation as the $U(1)$ phase transformation, while j^1 and j^2 are the boost operators. Especially the representation on the Dirac field is

given as

$$j = \frac{1}{2} ; \quad (7)$$

then transform s as

$$\psi(x) = e^{i\phi} \psi(x) = e^{\frac{i}{2}\phi} \psi(x) : \quad (8)$$

The Hamiltonian of our problem becomes

$$H = \int d^2x \left(\psi^\dagger \hat{H} \psi \right) + \frac{G}{2} \int d^2x (\psi^\dagger \psi)^2 : \quad (9)$$

Here, we introduce the chemical potential μ . In the relativistic field theory, it describes the finite density at $\mu = 0$ as the conjugate of the particle number minus antiparticle number. When we consider a crystal by the model, μ becomes the conjugate of the electron number in upper band minus hole number in lower band. μ determines the position of the Fermi level measured from the degeneracy point. The system has a Fermi circle at $\mu = 0$. Throughout this study, we completely neglect the temperature dependence of μ , and we treat μ as a parameter introduced from the outside of the system. Thus we set $\mu = \epsilon_F$ (Fermi energy). The Fermi level of graphite locates on the degeneracy point. Hence, in the case of intercalated graphite, μ determines the electron doping concentration.

Before closing this section, we would like to comment on the reason why we use the theory of the two-component Dirac field. In the theory of (2+1)-dimension, we have a choice between a two-component Dirac field and a four-component Dirac field. In fact, the dispersion of the honeycomb lattice has two degeneracy points. Gonzalez used a four-component theory to take into account the effect of the interaction between the two Fermi points in graphite [32]. However, the purpose of this paper is to extract the two-band effect, especially the lower-band effect. For this purpose, we have to construct the model as simple as possible. The criteria of our model are given as follows: (1) It will give a conical (relativistic) dispersion, (2) it has an interaction which may arise a superconductivity. From these criteria, we consider the Lagrangian (2) as the simplest model. If we use a four-component theory of superconductivity, it gives a problem of the effect of the interaction between two distinct Fermi circle. We regard that the effect is essentially different from the lower-band effect which is studied in the context of this paper. Hence we use a two-component theory, and treat the problem of a single conical-dispersion system. The operator ψ has

two linearly independent solutions; one for positive energy state and another for negative energy state. Therefore, though ψ is a two-component spinor, there is no degeneracy of a spin-degree of freedom. Both the upper and lower bands have no spin degeneracy. We treat a kind of spinless model, and it is enough for our purpose of this paper.

III. GOR'KOV FORMALISM

In this section, we derive the Gor'kov theory [44] for pairing problem under the attractive interaction $G > 0$ in the Lagrangian (2). The formalism given in this section is parallel with the (3+1)-dimensional theory [53-55]. The field equations are obtained from the Lagrangian (2) by the action principle:

$$0 = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \psi} - \partial_\mu \frac{\partial L}{\partial (\partial_\mu \psi)} = i \partial_t \psi + G (\psi); \quad (10)$$

$$0 = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \bar{\psi}} - \partial_\mu \frac{\partial L}{\partial (\partial_\mu \bar{\psi})} = -i \partial_t \bar{\psi} + G (\bar{\psi}); \quad (11)$$

For the derivation of the Gor'kov formalism, we introduce various propagators. We use the 4-component Nambu notation [56]:

$$\hat{\psi}(x) = \begin{pmatrix} \psi(x) \\ \psi^\dagger(x) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{\bar{\psi}}(x) = (\hat{\psi}(x); \hat{\psi}^T(x)); \quad (12)$$

where T means the transposition. The definition of the one-particle propagator is

$$G(x; y) = i \langle T \hat{\psi}(x) \hat{\bar{\psi}}(y) \rangle = i \begin{pmatrix} \langle T \psi(x) \bar{\psi}(y) \rangle & \langle T \psi(x) \psi^\dagger(y) \rangle \\ \langle T \psi^\dagger(x) \bar{\psi}(y) \rangle & \langle T \psi^\dagger(x) \psi(y) \rangle \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} S_F(x; y) & iF(x; y) \\ F(x; y) & S_F(y; x) \end{pmatrix}_A; \quad (13)$$

This is a 4×4 matrix. T means the time-ordered product, and $\langle \dots \rangle$ means the expectation value. S_F is the Feynman propagator for quasiparticle, while iF and F are the anomalous propagators. Next, we obtain the equations of motion for the propagators (13). We employ the Gor'kov factorization in (10) and (11), taking account of only the superconducting pair-correlation by introducing the mean-field approximation. Then we obtain the relativistically generalized (2+1)-dimensional Gor'kov equation written down as a 4×4 matrix equation:

$$\begin{pmatrix} i \partial_t + \epsilon_F & 0 \\ 0 & -i \partial_t + \epsilon_F \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \psi(x) \\ \psi^\dagger(x) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} S_F(x; y) & iF(x; y) \\ F(x; y) & S_F(y; x) \end{pmatrix}_A \begin{pmatrix} \psi(y) \\ \psi^\dagger(y) \end{pmatrix}.$$

$\langle x \rangle$ and $\langle x \rangle$ are 2×2 matrix mean fields, so called order parameters. The definitions are

$$(\mathbf{x}_0; \mathbf{x}) \text{ GF } (\mathbf{x}_0^+; \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{x}_0; \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{G} \mathbf{h}^{\top} (\mathbf{x}_0^+; \mathbf{x})^{\top} (\mathbf{x}_0; \mathbf{x}) \mathbf{i} \quad (16)$$

This gives the self-consistency condition. In general, the mean field clearly violates the Lorentz symmetry, as well as the gauge symmetry. In other words, the mean field involves quantities other than the scalar.

We will also obtain the Fourier transform of the Gorkov equation:

Here $\mathbf{K} = (\mathbf{k}_0 + \mathbf{K}; \mathbf{k})$ and $\mathbf{k} = (\mathbf{k}_0 + \mathbf{k}; \mathbf{k})$. \mathbf{K}^T means the transpose of \mathbf{K} . The self-consistency condition now becomes

Here the mean field has only the internal degrees of freedom.

The finite-temperature theory of the Matsubara formalism can be obtained in the same way. We introduce imaginary time $\tau = it$. The temperature Green's function is defined as

where $\langle \dots \rangle$ means the statistical average. From the equation of motion of the temperature Green's function, the Gor'kov equation becomes

8

Here the definition of the mean fields are the simple extension of those for the zero temperature:

$$\langle \psi(x) \rangle = GF(\psi^+; x; \psi; x) = G h^{\wedge}(\psi^+; x)^{\wedge T}(\psi; x) i; \quad (21)$$

$$\langle \bar{\psi}(x) \rangle = GF(\psi^+; x; \bar{\psi}; x) = G h^{\wedge T}(\psi^+; x)(\bar{\psi}; x) i; \quad (22)$$

Fourier transform is also obtained as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi^0(i!_n +) \rangle &\sim k \\ \langle \bar{\psi}^0 \rangle^T(i!_n) &= \langle \bar{\psi}^0 \rangle^T(i!_n) \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} A \begin{pmatrix} S(!_n; k) & F(!_n; k) \\ F(!_n; k) & S(!_n; k) \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Here $(k_B T)^{-1}$ (k_B ; the Boltzmann constant), $!_n = (2n + 1) =$ is a fermion discrete frequency. Solving Eq. (23), we will obtain the solutions of (17) in the same form, except that we need to substitute $k_0 \rightarrow !_n$.

IV. GROUP-THEORETICAL CONSIDERATION OF THE MEAN-FIELDS

Now we perform the group-theoretical consideration of the mean fields. Under the Lorentz transformation:

$$\psi^0(x^0) = S(\mathbf{x}) = \exp\left(\frac{i}{2} \mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{x}\right) \psi(\mathbf{x}); \quad (24)$$

then the mean field is transformed as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi^0 \rangle &= h \langle \psi^0 \rangle^0 T \langle \psi^0 \rangle i = h S(\mathbf{x})^T \langle \psi \rangle S^T i \\ &= S(\mathbf{x}) S^T \\ &= \left(1 + \frac{i}{2} \mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{x}\right) \langle \psi \rangle \left(1 + \frac{i}{2} \mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{x}\right)^T \\ &= \langle \psi \rangle + \frac{i}{2} \mathbf{J} \cdot \langle \psi \rangle \mathbf{C}^{-1} \mathbf{C} : \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Thus we can decompose the mean fields as follows:

$$\langle \psi \rangle = (\mathbf{S} + \mathbf{V}) \mathbf{C}; \quad \langle \bar{\psi} \rangle = \mathbf{C}^{-1} (\mathbf{S} + \mathbf{V}); \quad (26)$$

where S indicates scalar, while V indicates vector. Under the discrete transformations:

$$\begin{pmatrix} C \\ C^T \end{pmatrix} = i^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ T \end{pmatrix} ; \quad \begin{pmatrix} C \\ C^T \end{pmatrix} C^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} T \\ i^{-1} \end{pmatrix} ; \quad (27)$$

$$(x_0; x) \begin{pmatrix} P \\ P^T \end{pmatrix} = i^{-1} (x_0; x^0) ; \quad (x_0; x) \begin{pmatrix} P \\ P^T \end{pmatrix} = (x_0; x^0) (i^{-1}) ; \quad (28)$$

$$(x_0) \begin{pmatrix} T \\ T^T \end{pmatrix} = i^{-2} (x_0) ; \quad (x_0) \begin{pmatrix} T \\ T^T \end{pmatrix} = (x_0) (i^{-2}) ; \quad (29)$$

(here $x = (x_1; x_2)$ and $x^0 = (x_1; x_2)$), where C, P and T denote the operations of charge conjugation, spatial inversion and time reversal, respectively. Therefore, the mean fields are transformed as

$$h^T i \begin{pmatrix} C \\ C^T \end{pmatrix} h^T i C^{-1} = {}^2 h^T i^{-2} ; \quad (30)$$

$$h^T i \begin{pmatrix} C \\ C^T \end{pmatrix} h^T i C^{-1} = {}^2 h^T i^{-2} ; \quad (31)$$

$$h (x_0; x)^T (x_0; x) i \begin{pmatrix} P \\ P^T \end{pmatrix} = {}^1 h (x_0; x^0)^T (x_0; x^0) i^{-1} ; \quad (32)$$

$$h^T (x_0; x) (x_0; x) i \begin{pmatrix} P \\ P^T \end{pmatrix} = {}^1 h^T (x_0; x^0) (x_0; x^0) i^{-1} ; \quad (33)$$

$$h^T i \begin{pmatrix} T \\ T^T \end{pmatrix} = {}^2 h^T i^{-2} ; \quad (34)$$

$$h^T i \begin{pmatrix} T \\ T^T \end{pmatrix} = {}^2 h^T i^{-2} ; \quad (35)$$

Thus each type of the mean fields is transformed under the spatial inversion and time reversal as

$$s^2 \begin{pmatrix} P \\ P^T \end{pmatrix} = s^2 ; \quad (36)$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} T \\ T^T \end{pmatrix} = s^2 ; \quad (37)$$

$$v_0^0 \begin{pmatrix} P \\ P^T \end{pmatrix} = v_0^0 ; \quad (38)$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} T \\ T^T \end{pmatrix} = v_0^0 ; \quad (39)$$

$$v_1^1 \begin{pmatrix} P \\ P^T \end{pmatrix} = v_0^1 ; \quad (40)$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} T \\ T^T \end{pmatrix} = v_1^1 ; \quad (41)$$

$$v_2^2 \begin{pmatrix} P \\ P^T \end{pmatrix} = v_2^2 ; \quad (42)$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} T \\ T^T \end{pmatrix} = v_2^2 ; \quad (43)$$

Therefore, with 2-dimensional rotation and parity, the mean field is decomposed into three irreducible representations: s , v_0 and $(v_1; v_2)$. As expected, s violates the parity similar to the Dirac mass term m .

V. THE GAP EQUATION

In this section, we derive gap equations, and solve them numerically. For this purpose, first we have to solve the Gor'kov equation. Similar to the case of the (3+1)-dimensional theory [53-55], it is difficult to solve Eq. (17) or Eq. (23) completely in analytical form because of its matrix structure. Therefore we have to solve the equations assuming the type of the mean field that might be realized. Then we obtain three Gor'kov equations for each type of the mean fields. These equations can be solved in the same way as the case of the (3+1)-dimensional theory [53-55]. We give the following results. First the case of the scalar s :

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ S_F(k) & iF(k) \\ F(k) & S_F(-k)^T \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ A \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \frac{1}{D(k)} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ S_F(k) & iF(k) \\ F(k) & S_F(-k)^T \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ A \end{pmatrix} ; \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

$$D(k) = (K - K)(k - k) - 2j^s j^2 (K - k) + j^s j^4 ; \quad (45)$$

Next the case of 0th-component of vector v_0 :

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ S_F(k) & iF(k) \\ F(k) & S_F(-k)^T \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ A \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \frac{1}{D(k)} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ S_F(k) & iF(k) \\ F(k) & S_F(-k)^T \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ A \end{pmatrix} ; \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

$$D(k) = (K - K)(k - k) - 2j_0^v j^2 (K - k + 2k^2) + j_0^v j^4 ; \quad (47)$$

The case of 1st-component of vector v_1 :

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ S_F(k) & iF(k) \\ F(k) & S_F(-k)^T \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ A \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \frac{1}{D(k)} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ S_F(k) & iF(k) \\ F(k) & S_F(-k)^T \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ A \end{pmatrix} ; \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

$$D(k) = (\mathcal{K} - \mathcal{K})(k - k) - 2j_1^V j^P (\mathcal{K} - k + 2k_1^2) + j_1^V j^4: \quad (49)$$

In all cases, $D(k)$ is second order in k_0^2 , and we can easily factorized it as $D(k) = (k_0 - E_+)(k_0 + E_+)(k_0 - E_-)(k_0 + E_-)$. Here, E_+ corresponds to the energy of the quasiparticles coming from the upper band (positive energy states), while E_- corresponds to the energy of the quasiparticles coming from the lower band (negative energy states). Because (44), (46) and (48) are 4×4 matrices, there is no degeneracy in these branches of the dispersion relations. This case relates to the fact that we treat a kind of spinless model.

Now we construct the gap equations by using the Green's functions we have obtained. We use the finite-temperature Matsubara formalism. From the self-consistency conditions:

$$G_n^X = G_n^X \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int d^2k F_n^X(k); \quad (50)$$

we obtain the gap equation for the case of the scalar ϕ :

$$1 = \frac{G}{2} \int d^2k \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{1}{2E_+} \tanh \frac{E_+}{2} + \frac{1}{2E_-} \tanh \frac{E_-}{2}; \quad (51)$$

$$E_- = \sqrt{k^2 + j^2 + j^S j^2}; \quad (52)$$

The second term in the integrand is the contribution coming from negative energy states and/or the lower band. In the context of this paper, the relativistic effect is the two-band effect. For the case of the 0th-component of vector \mathbf{v}_0 , we get

$$1 = \frac{G}{2} \int d^2k \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{k^2 + j^2 + j_0^V j^2}} \tanh \frac{E_+}{2} + \tanh \frac{E_-}{2}; \quad (53)$$

$$E_- = \sqrt{k^2 + j^2 + j_0^V j^2}; \quad (54)$$

and the case of the 1st-component of vector \mathbf{v}_1 , we get

$$1 = \frac{G}{2} \int d^2k \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k^2 + j^2 + j_1^V j^2 k_1^2}} \frac{1}{2E_+} \tanh \frac{E_+}{2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{k^2 + j^2 + j_1^V j^2 k_1^2 + k_1^2}} \frac{1}{2E_-} \tanh \frac{E_-}{2} \right); \quad (55)$$

$$E_- = \sqrt{k^2 + j^2 + j_1^V j^2 k_1^2 + k_1^2}; \quad (56)$$

Integrals of Eqs. (51), (53) and (55) give positive quantities. Therefore, from these equations given above, we find there are possibilities to obtain the nontrivial solutions for the cases

of the scalar ψ and 0th-component of vector \vec{V}_0 . To examine whether these equations have nontrivial solutions or not, we have to check them more in detail. We will treat them numerically to study the characters of the solutions of these equations. We cannot obtain nontrivial solutions for the case of the spatial components of vector \vec{V}_1 and \vec{V}_2 , because the gap equations (55) become the form " $1 = \text{positive quantity}$ ".

For the integration of our gap equations, we take

$$\int_0^Z \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^2} = \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int_0^Z k dk = \frac{Z^2}{8\pi^2} : \quad (57)$$

Therefore, our gap equations include four parameters: Coupling constant G , chemical potential μ , momentum cutoff Λ and temperature T . Because our theory treats a massless case, there is no unit of energy in our theory. To see the effect of the lower band (Dirac sea) in the gap equation of the scalar case:

$$1 = \frac{G}{2\pi^2} \int_0^{\Lambda} \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{1}{2E_+} \tanh \frac{E_+}{2T} ; \quad (58)$$

$$E_+ = \sqrt{(k^2 + j^2) + j_{\text{no sea}}^2} ; \quad (59)$$

There is a simple scaling relation in our gap equations. When we transform the gap equation in next relations:

$$k^2 = k_0^2, \quad \Lambda = \Lambda_0; \quad j = j_0; \quad j_{\text{no sea}} = j_0^{\text{no sea}} ; \quad (60)$$

Eq.(51) is transformed as

$$1 = \frac{G}{8\pi^2} \int_0^{\Lambda_0} k_0^2 dk_0 \left[\frac{1}{(k_0^2 + j_0^2) + j_0^{\text{no sea}^2}} \tanh \frac{E_0}{2T} + \frac{1}{(k_0^2 + 1)^2 + j_0^{\text{no sea}^2}} \tanh \frac{E_0}{2T} \right] ; \quad (61)$$

Therefore, when the ratio Λ_0 is fixed and when we take $G_0 = G/\Lambda_0^2 = \text{const.}$, we treat the same equation with (61).

Usually, a gap is much smaller than the Fermi energy: $j \ll \mu$. For example, in the case of solid, the ratio $j(T=0)/\mu$ is $10^{-4} \sim 10^{-2}$. We have to choose model parameters G and Λ to satisfy the condition. In principle, we can choose Λ up to the energy scale where the conical dispersion is a good approximation. Both the Fermi momentum k_F and the upper bound of Λ should be in the order of the inverse of the lattice constant a^{-1} . Here,

we choose the momentum cut-off as $\Lambda = 2k_F = 2$, and fix it throughout this study. After choosing the values of parameters, the integration in the gap equation is performed, and search the self-consistency condition under the variation with respect to the amplitude of the gap. We have performed the integration in our gap equations by using the numerical package Mathematica version 4.1.

Figure 3 shows the gap at $T = 0$ as a function of the coupling constant G . Here we take the momentum cut-off as $\Lambda = 2 = 1$ and we set $\mu = 1$. Similar to the usual nonrelativistic BCS theory, both the scalar and "no sea" depend exponentially on G . The gap of the scalar is always larger than the "no sea" case. The ratio $j^S(T = 0)/j^{\text{no sea}}(T = 0)$ is almost always 1.57.

In Fig. 4, we show the temperature T dependence of the solutions in the scalar and "no sea" cases. Here we set $G = 2^{-1}$, $\mu = 1$ and $\Lambda = 2 = 1$. In the cases of graphite or MgB_2 , the relativistic model can be applied to the region of the energy width almost 1–2 eV. If we take $\mu = 1\text{eV}$ ($\mu = 2\text{eV}$), the critical temperature T_c becomes 38K (0.0033eV) for the scalar and 24K (0.0021eV) for the "no sea". The ratio $T_c^{\text{scalar}}/T_c^{\text{no sea}}$ is 1.57. Both the scalar and "no sea" cases fulfill the BCS universal constant $j(T = 0)/T_c = 1.76$ [57]. Therefore, both cases obey the BCS-like temperature dependence.

From our numerical results, we conclude that, the scalar (the two-band case) gives always larger solution than the "no sea" (the one-band case). The contribution coming from the lower band (the negative energy states) enhances the superconducting gap. It should be noted that, the values of the amplitude of the gap and the critical temperature do not predict the superconductivity in real substances directly, because it is impossible to remove the arbitrariness of the choice of the values of the model parameters completely. However, when we consider the two-band system, we have to keep in mind the fact that the lower band gives a sizable effect in the superconductivity.

About the 0th-component of vector case, we could not find a reasonable solution in our numerical calculation. The reason of this result should be understood in the following way. We rewrite Eq. (53) at T_c as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \frac{G}{8} \int_{-\Lambda}^{\Lambda} dp p \frac{1}{p} \left[\tanh \frac{\mu}{2} (p - \mu) + \tanh \frac{\mu}{2} (p + \mu) \right] \\ &= \frac{G}{4} \int_0^{\Lambda} dp p \left[\frac{1}{e^{(p-\mu)} + 1} + \frac{1}{e^{(p+\mu)} + 1} \right] : \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

The integral of the right hand side gives the conserved charge of the system. Therefore, the

equation for determination of T_c has no temperature dependence: We cannot determine T_c by Eq.(62). In the (3+1)-dimensional massive theory, the 0th-component of vector pairing gives a meaningful state, and we discussed various aspects of the relation between the scalar, "no sea", "nonrelativistic" and 0th-component of vector [53-55]. This fact contrast with the results of the (2+1)-dimensional theory.

VI. THE KOHN-LUTTINGER EFFECT

Now we consider the pairing problem with the repulsive interaction $G < 0$ in the Lagrangian (2). For this problem, we should examine the appearance of a pole in the 4-point function (the 2-particle Green's function, see Fig. 5 (a)) by using the Bethe-Salpeter (BS) formalism [44,58], like the work of Kohn and Luttinger [45]. We start with introducing the fermion-fermion BS equation [59] in the finite-temperature Matsubara formalism:

$$\Gamma(p) = \sum_n \frac{1}{Z} \frac{d^2 p^0}{(2\pi)^2} \tilde{\Gamma}(p; p^0) S(i_n; p^0) \Gamma^0 S(-i_n; p^0)^T : \quad (63)$$

We treat (63) as a function of temperature T , and the critical temperature T_c is determined when a self-consistent solution of $\Gamma(p)$ appear in Eq.(63). The normal-state fermion propagators are given as follows:

$$S(i_n; p) = \frac{1}{\not{p}}; \quad S(-i_n; p)^T = C^{-1} \frac{1}{\not{p}} C : \quad (64)$$

Here $\not{p} = (i\not{\partial}_n + \not{p})$ and $p = (i\not{\partial}_n; p)$. $\tilde{\Gamma}(p; p^0)$ is the irreducible vertex part. The BS amplitude $\Gamma(p)$ is decomposed as follows:

$$\Gamma(p) = (S(p) + V(p)) C \sum_{A=1}^{X^4} (\Gamma_A^A) C : \quad (65)$$

Here, S and V denote scalar and vector, respectively. $\Gamma(p)$ has to fulfill the Pauli principle:

$$\Gamma(p) = -\Gamma(p) : \quad (66)$$

Then, each component should obey the following relations:

$$S(p)C = -S(p)C; \quad V(p)(-C) = -V(p)(-C) : \quad (67)$$

Therefore we get

$$S(p) = -S(p); \quad V(p) = V(p) : \quad (68)$$

In Eq. (63), replace $\langle p \rangle$ to the expanded form (Eq. (65)), and take trace of both sides, we obtain the following form :

$$\langle p \rangle \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\langle A \rangle \langle A \rangle) = \sum_n \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^2 p^0}{(2\pi)^2} \tilde{\chi}(p; p^0) \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \langle A \rangle S(\omega_n; p^0) \langle A \rangle S(\omega_n; p^0)^T \quad (69)$$

Similar to the treatment of the Gor'kov equation in Sec.V, we completely neglect couplings between different types of pairing functions. Then, for specific A , we obtain the following equations:

$$\langle s \rangle(p) = \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^2 p^0}{(2\pi)^2} \tilde{\chi}(p; p^0) \langle s \rangle(p^0) \\ \frac{1}{2(\tilde{p}^0 j)} \tanh \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{p}^0 j) + \frac{1}{2(\tilde{p}^0 j +)} \tanh \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{p}^0 j +) ; \quad (70)$$

$$\langle v_0 \rangle(p) = \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^2 p^0}{(2\pi)^2} \tilde{\chi}(p; p^0) \langle v_0 \rangle(p^0) \frac{1}{2} \left(\tanh \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{p}^0 j) + \tanh \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{p}^0 j +) \right) ; \quad (71)$$

$$\langle v_1 \rangle(p) = \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^2 p^0}{(2\pi)^2} \tilde{\chi}(p; p^0) \langle v_1 \rangle(p^0) \frac{1}{2 \tilde{p}^0 j} \\ \frac{(\tilde{p}_1^0)^2}{\tilde{p}^0 j} \tanh \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{p}^0 j) + \frac{(\tilde{p}_1^0)^2 + \tilde{p}^0 j}{\tilde{p}^0 j +} \tanh \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{p}^0 j +) : \quad (72)$$

In this paper, we estimate $\tilde{\chi}(p; p^0)$ by using a random phase approximation (RPA) (as illustrated in Fig. 5(b)). The polarization is given as

$$\langle \omega_1; q \rangle = \sum_n \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^2 p}{(2\pi)^2} \text{tr} S(\omega_1 + \omega_n; p + q) S(\omega_n; p) : \quad (73)$$

Here, ω_1 is a boson discrete frequency. After summing up ω_n , we neglect ω_1 dependence of $\langle \omega_1; q \rangle$ to obtain the static polarization:

$$\langle 0; q \rangle = \int \frac{d^2 p}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{1}{\tilde{p}^0 + q^0} \frac{1}{\tilde{p}^0} \\ \left(\frac{\tilde{p}^0}{\tilde{p}^0} \frac{q^0}{e^{(\tilde{p}^0)} + 1} + \frac{1}{e^{(\tilde{p}^0 +)} + 1} \right) \frac{1}{\tilde{p}^0} \\ + \frac{(\tilde{p}^0 + q^0)}{\tilde{p}^0 + q^0} \frac{q^0}{e^{(\tilde{p}^0 + q^0)} + 1} + \frac{1}{e^{(\tilde{p}^0 + q^0 +)} + 1} \frac{1}{\tilde{p}^0} ; \quad (74)$$

where, $\tilde{p}^0 = \tilde{p}^0 j$ is the relativistic dispersion form massless particle. The integration in (74) has a ultraviolet divergence, and we have to introduce a momentum cutoff. To obtain $\langle 0; q \rangle$, we perform the integration numerically in Eq. (74). Figure 6 shows the results of numerical integration for $\langle 0; q \rangle$ with several T . Here we set $\mu = 2p_F = 2$ with $\beta = 1$. We find

a peak near $q = 2p_F$. This behavior is a reflection of the sharpness of the Fermi surface. The peak decreases when T increases. To treat the Cooper problem, we concentrate on the behavior of $\chi(q)$ at the Fermi surface. To see this, we define $q = p - p^0$ and substitute q to $p - p^0$ in $\chi(q)$. Then we set $p = p^0 = p_F$, we get $\chi(p_F; p_F; \cos \theta)$. Here $\theta = \angle(p, p^0)$. We calculate $\chi(p_F; p_F; \cos \theta)$ numerically. Figure 7 shows the angular dependence of $\chi(p_F; p_F; \cos \theta)$ with several T . The dent at $\theta = \pi$ grows when T increases. At enough low temperatures, the angular dependence is almost \cos^2 , and then we can use the following expression to examine the pairing properties of the system:

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(p_F; p_F; \cos \theta)_{T=0} &= \frac{1}{2} (1 + \cos \theta) + \frac{1}{2} (1 - \cos \theta) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (1 + \cos \theta) + \frac{1}{2} (1 - \cos \theta) \cos^2 \theta: \quad (75) \end{aligned}$$

From Fig. 7, we find $\chi(0) = 0.0284$. Then we obtain the expression for $\tilde{\chi}(p; p^0)$ at low temperatures within the RPA:

$$\tilde{\chi}(p; p^0) = \frac{G}{1 - G \chi(p_F; p_F; \cos \theta)}: \quad (76)$$

To obtain the BS equation for specific symmetry of pairing, we employ the angular decomposition to $\chi(p)$ and $\tilde{\chi}(p; p^0)$. The two-dimensional angular momentum eigenfunction is given as

$$Y_l(\theta) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} e^{il\theta}; \quad (77)$$

where, l is an angular momentum quantum number in a two-dimensional system. We only consider the time-reversal invariant pairings because of simplicity. Therefore, we take a linear combination:

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (e^{il\theta} + e^{-il\theta}) = \cos l\theta: \quad (78)$$

Each component of the amplitude is decomposed by this function:

$$\chi^s(p) = \sum_{l \text{ even}} \chi^s_l(p) \cos l\theta = \sum_{l \text{ even}} \chi^s_l(p_F) \cos l\theta; \quad (79)$$

$$\chi^v_0(p) = \sum_{l \text{ even}} \chi^v_0(p) \cos l\theta = \sum_{l \text{ even}} \chi^v_0(p_F) \cos l\theta; \quad (80)$$

$$\chi^v_j(p) = \sum_{j \text{ odd}} \chi^v_j(p) \cos j\theta = \sum_{j \text{ odd}} \chi^v_j(p_F) \cos j\theta; \quad (j = 1, 3, \dots): \quad (81)$$

Here, we neglect p_j dependence of the amplitudes for weak coupling approximation: $j(p_j) \approx j$. Because of (68), we choose even l for scalar in Eq.(79), while we choose odd $l(j)$ for vector pairings in Eqs.(80) and (81). The irreducible vertex part is also decomposed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{G^{-1}(\mathbf{p})=2 + \cos \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{p}^0} &= \frac{1}{G^{-1}(\mathbf{p})=2} \\ &+ \frac{\cos \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{p}^0}{(G^{-1}(\mathbf{p})=2)^2} \\ &+ \frac{\cos^2 \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{p}^0}{(G^{-1}(\mathbf{p})=2)^3} \\ &+ \frac{\cos^3 \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{p}^0}{(G^{-1}(\mathbf{p})=2)^4} + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

Therefore, when we decide the quantum number l (or j) of a BS amplitude, the components coupled with the effective interaction $\tilde{v}(\mathbf{p}; \mathbf{p}^0)$ are determined a priori: From the form of the expansion given in Eq. (82), we find the fact that, 1st, 3rd, ... terms in Eq. (82) couple only with components of even l , while 2nd, 4th, ... terms in Eq. (82) couple with components of odd $l(j)$. It is an important fact that, the sign in each term in the expansion for \tilde{v} alternates between plus and minus.

Based on the preparation given above, we obtain the BS equations for specific l (or j) of several types of pairings. For the case of the scalar:

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \frac{1}{8^{\frac{1}{2}}} \tilde{\Gamma} \int_0^Z p^0 dp^0 \\ &\quad \frac{1}{2(\mathbf{p}^0 j)} \tanh \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{p}^0 j) + \frac{1}{2(\mathbf{p}^0 j+)} \tanh \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{p}^0 j+) : \end{aligned} \quad (83)$$

For the 0th-component of vector:

$$1 = \frac{1}{8^{\frac{1}{2}}} \tilde{\Gamma} \int_0^Z p^0 dp^0 \frac{1}{2} \left[\tanh \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{p}^0 j) + \tanh \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{p}^0 j+) \right] : \quad (84)$$

Here $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is determined as

$$\tilde{\Gamma} = \int_0^{Z_2} d\mathbf{p}_1 \int_0^{Z_2} d\mathbf{p}_2 \frac{\cos l_1 \cos l_2}{G^{-1}(\mathbf{p})=2 + \cos l_{12}}; \quad (85)$$

where $\mathbf{p}_1 = \mathbf{p}$, $\mathbf{p}_2 = \mathbf{p}^0$ and $l_{12} = \mathbf{p}_1 \cdot \mathbf{p}_2$. In principle, we have to choose \tilde{v} in our BS equations (83) and (84) as the same value for the polarization in Eq.(74). By using

the expansion (82), when $G < 0$, we find the following fact: In the angular integration of \tilde{T} , there are only negative contribution for \tilde{T} ($\tilde{T} < 0$) of the scalar case, while there are only positive contribution for \tilde{T} ($\tilde{T} > 0$) of the vector case. Therefore, from Eq.(83), we recognize that there is no solution in the scalar pairing. From the same reason given in the discussion for Eq. (62), we cannot find solution for the 0th-component of vector case. For the spatial-component of vector, we get

$$1 = \frac{1}{8} \frac{\int_0^{\pi/2} \int_0^{\pi/2} \int_0^{\pi/2} p_0^0 p_1^0 p_2^0 d_1 d_2}{\cos j_1 \cos j_2} \frac{G^{-1} \left(\left(\frac{p}{\mu} \right)^2 + \cos_{12} \right)}{\frac{1}{2} \frac{p_0^0}{p^0 j} \frac{p_1^0 \cos^2 j_2}{p^0 j} \frac{p_2^0}{p^0 j} \tanh \frac{1}{2} (p^0 j) + \frac{p_1^0 \cos^2 j_2 + p_2^0}{p^0 j} \tanh \frac{1}{2} (p^0 j)} \quad (86)$$

In Eq. (86), the angular integration gives the negative quantity, but the integrand of momentum integration is also always negative with respect to the variation of T . Therefore, it is impossible to find T_c , and we have no solution in the spatial-component of vector. The summary of the results of the solutions of various types of our gap equations and BS equations are presented in table I. Only the scalar pairing in the attractive interaction can have nontrivial solution. In our treatment (BS-RPA), we could not find a KL effect in our model. Baranov et al. [60] obtained a conclusion that no pairing instability arises in a two-space-dimensional nonrelativistic model with second order perturbation. Chubukov performed a calculation beyond second order: He included a vertex correction, and showed that the KL effect arises in the two-space-dimensional Fermi liquid [47]. Our negative result of the KL effect is based on both the single conical dispersion model and the angular dependence of the irreducible vertex part estimated by RPA. Therefore, our result does not deny the presence of the KL effect in (2+1)-dimensional systems completely. In fact, Gonzalez et al. showed the presence of the KL effect in graphite, by taking into account the interaction between two inequivalent Fermi points carefully [32]. On the other hand, as discussed in the introduction, we have set the purpose of this paper just to examine the lower-band effect in superconductivity. For the purpose, we use a single relativistic-dispersion model with $\epsilon > 0$. The situation of our model is different from that of the work of Gonzalez et al.

VII. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this paper, we have investigated the relativistic model of two-band superconductivity in $(2+1)$ -dimension. After we have introduced the model Lagrangian, we have derived the $(2+1)$ -dimensional relativistic Gorkov equation for the pairing problem under the four-fermion contact attractive interaction. We have performed the group-theoretical consideration of the gap functions. The characteristic aspects of the gap functions were revealed. By using the Gorkov formalism, we have derived the gap equations for several types of pairings, and have solved them numerically. We have understood quantitatively the effect of the lower band in the two-band superconductivity: We have found the lower band enhances the superconductivity. We also have examined the pairing problem under the repulsive interaction (the KL effect), by using the BS formalism.

Now, we discuss some remaining problems and/or further possible investigations in our theory. It is interesting to perform the calculations of the response function or polarization function under the presence of electromagnetic field, because of the reason that those functions can give the Chern-Simons (CS) term or not. Goryo and Ishikawa discussed the induction of the CS term in $(2+1)$ -dimensional nonrelativistic theory, with parity and time-reversal violating superconductors [61]. Hosotani showed the $(2+1)$ -dimensional QED with the CS term dynamically generate a magnetic field [62]. Miransky et al. studied the fact that an external magnetic field enhances a fermion dynamical mass, and this phenomenon is universal in any models of $(2+1)$ and $(3+1)$ dimensional field theories [63]. We suppose these studies should have an intrinsic relation. We have a plan to investigate these physics in our model in near future.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to express his gratitude sincerely to Professor Yoichiro Nambu, for his enlightening discussions and comments. Thanks are also due to Professor Hiroshi Toki, for his critical reading of this paper. The author is also grateful to Professors H. Akai, T. Morinari, H. Nagao, M. Nakano, H. Tsunetsugu, K. Yamaguchi, D. Yamaki and S.

Yam anaka, for their encouragem ents during this work.

- ¹ E .Fradkin, Field Theories of C ondense d M atter System s (Addison-W esley, New -York, 1991), A .M .T svelik, Q uantum Field Theory in C ondense d M atter Physics (C am bridge U niversity Press, New -York, 1995).
- ² T .M oriya, Y .Takahashi and K .Ueda, J.Phys.Soc.Jpn.59, 2905 (1990), T .M oriya and K .Ueda, J.Phys.Soc.Jpn.63, 1871 (1994), T .Takim oto and T .M oriya, J.Phys.Soc.Jpn, 66, 2459 (1997).
- ³ T .H otta, J.Phys.Soc.Jpn.62, 4414 (1993), 63, 4126 (1994).
- ⁴ S.K oikeyam i, S.Fujim oto and K .Yam ada, J.Phys.Soc.Jpn.66, 1438 (1997).
- ⁵ P.M onthoux, A .V .B alatsky and D .P ines, Phys.Rev.Lett.67, 3448 (1991), P.M onthoux and D .P ines, Phys.Rev.Lett.69, 961 (1992).
- ⁶ A .V .C hubukov, D .P ines and J.Schm alian, cond-m at/0201140.
- ⁷ P.M onthoux and G .G .Lonzarich, Phys.Rev.B 59, 14598 (1999).
- ⁸ J.Nagamatsu, N .Nakagawa, T .M uranaka, Y .Zenitani and J.A kim itsu, Nature 410, 63 (2001).
- ⁹ T .A ndo, Y .Zheng and H .Suzuura, J.Phys.Soc.Jpn.71, 1318 (2002).
- ¹⁰ K .K uroki, R .A rita and H .A oki, cond-m at/0006218.
- ¹¹ R .A rita, K .K uroki and H .A oki, Phys.Rev.60, 14585 (1999).
- ¹² S.O nari, K .K uroki, R .A rita and H .A oki, Phys.Rev.65, 184525 (2002).
- ¹³ K .K uroki, T .K im ura, R .A rita, Y .Tanaka and Y .M atsuda, Phys.Rev.65, 100516 (2002).
- ¹⁴ K .K uroki, R .A rita and H .A oki, Phys.Rev.B 60, 9850 (1999), K .K uroki and R .A rita, Phys.Rev.B 63, 174507 (2001), Phys.Rev.64, 024501 (2001).
- ¹⁵ H .K ontani and K .Ueda, Phys.Rev.Lett.80, 5619 (1998).
- ¹⁶ G .E sirgen and N .E .B ickers, Phys.Rev.B 57, 5376 (1998).
- ¹⁷ H .Suhl, B .T .M atthias and L .R .W alker, Phys.Rev.Lett.3, 552 (1959).
- ¹⁸ J.K ondo, Prog.Theor.Phys.29, 1 (1963).
- ¹⁹ J.K ondo, J.Phys.Soc.Jpn.71, 1353 (2002).
- ²⁰ K .Yam aji, J.Phys.Soc.Jpn.59, 677 (1990), 70, 1476 (2001).
- ²¹ K .Sengupta and S.K .G hatak, Phys.Lett.A 186, 419 (1994).
- ²² M .Im ada, J.Phys.Soc.Jpn.70, 1218 (2001).

- ²³ N . Nakai, M . Ichioka and K . Machida, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 71, 23 (2002).
- ²⁴ C . P . M oca and C . H orea, Phys. Rev. B 66, 052501 (2002).
- ²⁵ G . M . Japiassu, M . A . Continentino and A . T roper, Phys. Rev. B 45, 2986 (1992), L . G . Sarasua and M . A . Continentino, Phys. Rev. B 65, 184503 (2002).
- ²⁶ H . N agao, M . N ishino, Y . Shigeta, Y . Yoshioka and K . Yam aguchi, J. Chem . Phys. 113, 11237 (2000).
- ²⁷ Y . Tanaka, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 70, 2844 (2001), Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 017002 (2002).
- ²⁸ E . B abaev, L . D . Faddeev and A . J . N iemi, Phys. Rev. 65, 100512 (2002), E . B abaev, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 177002 (2002).
- ²⁹ H . Schm idt, J . F . Zasadzinski, K . E . G ray and D . G . H inks, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 127002 (2002).
- ³⁰ G . W . Sem eno , Phys. Rev. Lett. 53, 2449 (1984). See also, H . B . N ielsen and M . N inom iya, Phys. Lett. 130B , 389 (1983), A . J . N iemi and G . W . Sem eno , Phys. Rep. 135, 99 (1986).
- ³¹ F . D . M . H aldane, Phys. Rev. Lett. 61, 2015 (1988).
- ³² J . G onzalez, F . G uinea and M . A . H . Vozm ediano, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 3589 (1996), Phys. Rev. B 63, 134421 (2001), J . G onzalez, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 076404 (2002).
- ³³ D . V . K hveshchenko, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 246802 (2001).
- ³⁴ G . B askaran and S . A . Jafari, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 016402 (2002).
- ³⁵ R . Shankar, Phys. Rev. Lett. 63, 203 (1989).
- ³⁶ L . B . I o e and A . I . Larkin, Phys. Rev. B 39, 8988 (1989), J . B . M arston and I . A eck, Phys. Rev. B 39, 11538 (1989), N . D orey and N . E . M avrom atos, Phys. Lett. B 250, 107 (1990), Phys. Rev. B 44, 5286 (1991), Nucl. Phys. B 386, 614 (1992), I . J . R . A itchison and N . E . M avrom atos, Phys. Rev. B 53, 9321 (1996), W . Chen, M . P . A . Fisher and Y . S . W u, Phys. Rev. B 48, 13749 (1993), W . V . L iu, Nucl. Phys. B 556, 563 (1999), P . B . W iegm ann, Phys. Rev. Lett. 65, 2070 (1990), Phys. Rev. B 59, 15705 (1999), A . G . A banov and P . B . W iegm ann, Phys. Rev. B 57, 8532 (1998), J . Ye, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 227003 (2001), M . Franz and Z . Tesanovic, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 257003 (2001), Z . Tesanovic, O . Vafek and M . Franz, Phys. Rev. B 65, 180511 (2002), M . Franz, D . E . Sheehy and Z . Tesanovic, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 257005 (2002), M . Franz, Z . Tesanovic and O . Vafek, Phys. Rev. B 66, 054535 (2002).
- ³⁷ S . D eser, R . Jackiw and S . Tem pletton, Phys. Rev. Lett. 48, 975 (1982), Ann. Phys. 140, 372 (1982).
- ³⁸ B . B inegar, J. Math. Phys. 23, 1511 (1982).

- ³⁹ A . J . Niem i and G . W . Sem eno , Phys. Rev. Lett. 51, 2077 (1983).
- ⁴⁰ A . N . Redlich, Phys. Rev. Lett. 52, 18 (1984), Phys. Rev. D 29, 2366 (1984).
- ⁴¹ R . Jackiw and V . P . Nair, Phys. Rev. D 43, 1933 (1991).
- ⁴² The kagom e lattice is a three-band system , but it has conical dispersions sim ilar to the case of the honeycom b lattice.
- ⁴³ J . M . Kosterlitz and D . J . Thouless, J. Phys. C 6, 1181 (1973), J . M . Kosterlitz, J. Phys. C 7, 1046 (1974).
- ⁴⁴ A . A . Abrikosov, L . P . G or'kov and I . E . D zyaloshinskii, M ethods of Q uantum F ield Theory in Statistical Physics (D over, New York, 1963).
- ⁴⁵ W . Kohn and J . M . Luttinger, Phys. Rev. Lett. 15, 524 (1965), J . M . Luttinger, Phys. Rev. 150, 202 (1966).
- ⁴⁶ R . Shankar, Physica A 177, 530 (1991).
- ⁴⁷ A . V . Chubukov and J . P . Lu, Phys. Rev. B 46, 11163 (1992), A . V . Chubukov, Phys. Rev. 48, 1097 (1993).
- ⁴⁸ V . A . M iransky, D ynam ical Sym m etry B reaking in Q uantum F ield Theories (W orld Scienti c, Singapore, 1993).
- ⁴⁹ B . Rosenstein, B . J . W arr and S . H . Park, Phys. Rep. 205, 59 (1991).
- ⁵⁰ K . G . K lim enko, Z. Phys. C 37, 457 (1988), C 54, 323 (1992).
- ⁵¹ A . O kopinska, Phys. Rev. D 38, 2507 (1988).
- ⁵² T . Inagaki, T . Kouno and T . M uta, Int. J. M od. Phys. A 10, 2241 (1995).
- ⁵³ T . O hsaku, Thesis, D epartm ent of Physics, O saka U niversity (2000).
- ⁵⁴ T . O hsaku, Phys. Rev. B 65, 024512 (2002).
- ⁵⁵ T . O hsaku, Phys. Rev. B 66, 054518 (2002).
- ⁵⁶ Y . Nambu, Phys. Rev. 117, 648 (1960).
- ⁵⁷ A . L . Fetter and D . J . W alecka, Q uantum Theory of M any-P article System s (M cG raw -H ill, New York, 1971).
- ⁵⁸ L . P . G or'kov and T . K . M elik-Barkhudarov, Sov. Phys. JETP 13, 1018 (1961), L . P . G or'kov and L . P . P itaevskii, Sov. Phys. JETP 15, 417 (1962).
- ⁵⁹ N . Nakanishi, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. 43, 1 (1969).
- ⁶⁰ M . A . Baranov, A . V . Chubukov and M . Yu. Kagan, Int. J. M od. Phys. B 6, 2471 (1992).
- ⁶¹ J . G oryo and K . Ishikawa, Phys. Lett. A 246, 549 (1998), Phys. Lett. A 260, 294 (1999).

TABLE I: List of solutions for various pairings.

pairing sym m etry	G or'kov ($G > 0$)	Bethe-Salpeter-RPA ($G < 0$)
scalar	possible	no solution
0th-com ponent of vector	no solution	no solution
spatial-com ponent of vector	no solution	no solution

⁶² Y . H osotani, Phys. Lett. B 319, 332 (1993), Phys. Rev. D 51, 2022 (1995).

⁶³ V . P . Gusynin, V . A . M iransky and I. A . Shovkovy, Phys. Rev. D 52, 4718 (1995).

FIG. 1: (a) The structure of the honeycomb lattice. A and B denote the two different sublattice sites. (b) A schematic figure of the band structure of the honeycomb lattice. By symmetry, the hexagonal two-dimensional Brillouin zone of it has two degeneracy points. In the case of graphite, the Fermi levels locate on these points. In this paper, we use a Dirac fermion model with $\epsilon_F = 0$. Our theory can be applied to electron-doped graphite, etc.

FIG. 2: A schematic figure of the relativistic dispersion in a two-dimensional system. ϵ_F denotes the Fermi energy of the system.

FIG. 3: The G dependence of the pairing gap at $T = 0$. We set $\mu = 2k_F = 2$ and $\beta = 1$.

FIG. 4: The temperature dependence of the pairing gap. We set $G = 2^{-1}$, $\mu = 1$ and $\beta = 2 = 1$.

FIG. 5: (a) The diagrammatic representation for the two-particle Green's function $G^{(2)}$. $\tilde{\sim}$ denotes the irreducible vertex part. (b) The diagram for the irreducible vertex part within the RPA. The solid points represent the bare vertices G .

FIG. 6: The q -dependence of the static polarization $\chi(0; q)$ under various temperature. Here we set $\mu = 1$ and $\beta = 2 = 1$.

FIG. 7: The θ -dependence of the static polarization $\chi(0; k_F; k_F; \cos \theta)$ under various temperature. Here we set $\mu = 1$ and $\beta = 2 = 1$.






Fig.1(a)

author: Tadafumi Ohsaku
 title: Relativistic Model of two-band Superconductivity
 in (2+1)-dimension



first Brillouin zone

author: Tadafumi Ohsaku
 title: Relativistic Model of two-band Superconductivity
 in (2+1)-dimension

Fig.1(b)




Fig.2

author: Tadafumi Ohsaku
 title: Relativistic Model of two-band Superconductivity
 in (2+1)-dimension

Fig.3







Fig.4





author: Tadafumi Ohsaku
 title: Relativistic Model of Superconductivity
 in (2+1)-dimension

Fig.5(a)



author: Tadafumi Ohsaku
 title: Relativistic Model of two-band Superconductivity
 in (2+1)-dimension

Fig.5(b)

Fig.6




Fig.7

