

# Intershell resistance in multiwall carbon nanotubes: A Coulomb drag study

Anders Mathias Lunde<sup>y,z</sup>, Karsten Flensberg<sup>y</sup> and Antti-Pekka Jauho<sup>z</sup>

<sup>y</sup>*Ørsted Laboratory, Niels Bohr Institute, University of Copenhagen, DK-2100 Copenhagen, Denmark*

<sup>z</sup>*MIC-Department of Micro and Nanotechnology, Technical University of Denmark, Ørsted's Plads, Bldg. 345 east, DK-2800 Kgs. Lyngby, Denmark*

(Dated: March 22, 2024)

We calculate the intershell resistance  $R_{21}$  in a multiwall carbon nanotube as a function of temperature  $T$  and Fermi level  $\mu_F$  (e.g. a gate voltage), varying the chirality of the inner and outer tubes. This is done in a so-called Coulomb drag setup, where a current  $I_1$  in one shell induces a voltage drop  $V_2$  in another shell by the screened Coulomb interaction between the shells neglecting the intershell tunnelling. We provide benchmark results for  $R_{21} = V_2/I_1$  within the Fermi liquid theory using Boltzmann equations. The band structure gives rise to strongly chirality dependent suppression effects for the Coulomb drag between different tubes due to selection rules combined with mismatching of wave vector and crystal angular momentum conservation near the Fermi level. This gives rise to orders of magnitude changes in  $R_{21}$  and even the sign of  $R_{21}$  can change depending on the chirality of the inner and outer tube and misalignment of inner and outer tube Fermi levels. However for *any* tube combination, we predict a dip (or peak) in  $R_{21}$  as a function of gate voltage, since  $R_{21}$  vanishes at the electron-hole symmetry point. As a byproduct, we classified *all* metallic tubes into either zigzag-like or armchair-like, which have two different non-zero crystal angular momenta  $m_a$ ,  $m_b$  and only zero angular momentum, respectively.

## I. INTRODUCTION

### A. General considerations on nanotubes

Carbon nanotubes are widely recognized as being among the most promising materials for future nanotechnology applications. Furthermore, they are of fundamental scientific interest due to several unique electronic, mechanical and thermal properties.<sup>1</sup> These properties often depend on the microscopic details of their composition, e.g. the way the graphene sheets are rolled into tubes and whether one has a single or multiwall carbon nanotube or a rope or bundle of these. Electrical transport measurements have shown a tendency for ballistic transport in individual singlewall carbon nanotubes<sup>2,3,4</sup> (SWCNT) and diffusive transport in multiwall carbon nanotubes<sup>4,5,6,7</sup> (MWCNT), but this issue is not completely settled yet<sup>8</sup> and seems to depend crucially on the contacts to the tubes and the amount of defects and impurities in and near the tube. Many experiments<sup>9,10,11,12,13,14,15</sup> have explored the Coulomb blockade regime, where the tube can be treated as a quantum dot, due to poor electric contact. More recently, better electrical contacts have been achieved,<sup>3,16,17,18</sup> which gives larger conductance, approaching the predicted  $\frac{4e^2}{h}$ , and a coherent (or Landauer-Büttiker-like) regime is thereby reached. Palladium seems to be a promising candidate for good future ohmic contacts.<sup>17,18</sup> Another interesting feature of carbon nanotubes is their one-dimensional nature, which may have profound consequences on the basic physical phenomenology for their description: SWCNT's have been predicted to be Luttinger liquids<sup>19,20</sup> and some experimental evidence exists<sup>21,22</sup> even though other interpretations have been suggested.<sup>23</sup> Whether MWCNT's are Fermi or Luttinger Liquids has been investigated extensively experimentally<sup>24,25,26</sup> and theoretically<sup>27</sup> and




FIG. 1: (Left): The experimental setup to directly measure the Coulomb drag effect in a MWCNT. The intershell resistance is  $R_{21} = V_2/I_1$ . (Right): The basic mechanism in the intershell resistance in a drag configuration: the intershell  $e-e$  interaction and thereby momentum transfer to induce the voltage drop  $V_2$ .

seems to depend on the situation, but is still subject to debate. Also in ropes the situation is not clear yet.<sup>28</sup>

The structure of this paper is as follows. We begin by introducing the intershell resistance problem in MWCNT's and our approach to it in section IB. In section IC we review the basic qualitative features of our theory of the intershell resistance using a Coulomb drag setup. Sections II and III are devoted to a summary of the band structure and a calculation of the screened Coulomb matrix element including the important suppression rules for backscattering in metallic tubes, and in section IV we indicate how the standard transresistance formulae are modified in the nanotube configuration. Sections V, VI and VII give our results for several different nanotube combinations. Details of the nanotube band structure and the screening model including the band structure are found in the appendices.






FIG. 2: The two categories of metallic nanotubes: Armchair-like (AL, left) and zigzag-like (ZL, right). The AL bands near  $\epsilon_F = 0$  have zero crystal angular momentum  $m = 0$  and  $\pi = \pm 1$ , where  $k_0 = \frac{2}{3\mathcal{T}}j$ . The ZL tubes have doubly degenerate bands crossing  $\epsilon_F = 0$ , i.e. for each  $\pi = \pm 1$  we have either  $m_a = \frac{2n+m}{3} \pmod{n}$  or  $m_b = \frac{2m+n}{3} \pmod{n}$ , where  $m_a \notin m_b$ , ( $n = \gcd(n; m)$ ). The thin lines are the tight-binding bands near  $\epsilon_F = 0$  for a  $(n; n)$  tube (with  $\mathcal{T}j = a$ ) and a  $(3m; 0)$  tube.

stemming from the intershell Coulomb matrix element between the Bloch states. (In the final formula some SR is incorporated into the F-functions). As known from experimental<sup>15</sup> and theoretical<sup>68,69,70</sup> studies, backscattering between the linear bands in metallic tubes by impurities with slowly varying potentials are strongly suppressed leading to very long mean free paths. The selection rules for intershell Coulomb interaction lead to a similar suppression, which depends strongly on the inner and outer tubes' chirality. A detailed analysis of these effects is one of the central tasks of the present article. The structure of Eq. (1) is much richer than its counterparts' for coupled quantum wells due to the rather complicated band structure combinations of the various MWCNT's.

## II. CARBON NANOTUBE BAND STRUCTURE

In appendix A, we give a detailed account for the band structure of a SWCNT with chirality  $(n; m)$ , since it turns out to be of crucial importance to the intershell Coulomb matrix element and thereby also for the drag. Here we only outline the important points of the band structure used later.

The carbon nanotube band structure can be found by applying periodic boundary conditions to the band structure of a single graphite layer (graphene). Graphene has two atoms in the primitive unit cell, so the tight-binding state (or Wannier decomposition) have two components with weights  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  (see Eq. (A.5)). When applying the periodic boundary condition the wave vector component around the tube  $k_c$  becomes quantized into a discrete values,  $k_c = \frac{2}{\mathcal{T}}n_c$ . However, it is important to realize that  $n_c$  is *not* the crystal angular momentum  $m$  stemming from the rotation symmetry, but only related to it by  $n_c = m \pmod{n}$ . (Here  $\mathcal{C}$  is the chiral vector and  $n$  is the greatest common divisor of  $(n; m)$ ,  $n = \gcd(n; m)$ ). This is due to the non-primitive (large) nanotube unit cell, when using translational symmetry instead of helical symmetry.<sup>71,72</sup>

Linearizing the tight-binding band structure around the Fermi level  $\epsilon_F = 0$  the states and bands for metallic tubes near  $\epsilon_F$  become

$$\epsilon_{k_T} = v_0 K_T \quad \text{and} \quad (2)$$

$$v_0 = \frac{1}{\mathcal{T}} \frac{i(m_a - n) \epsilon_{km}^p \bar{3}(n+m)}{2(n^2 + m^2 + mn)}; \quad (3)$$

where  $K_T$  is the wave vector along the tube *measured* from the point, where the band crosses  $\epsilon_F = 0$ , ( $K_T = k - k_{\epsilon_F=0}$ ),  $\epsilon_{km}^p = \pm 1$  is the sign of the velocity in the band and  $\epsilon = \pm 1$  describes which  $K_{\epsilon}$  point of graphene the linear band originate from. Here  $v_0 = \frac{\bar{3}v_{0a}}{2}$  with  $v_0 \approx 3\text{eV}$  and  $a = \bar{3}a_{c-c}$  ( $a_{c-c} = 0.142\text{nm}$ ). The metallic states can thus described by  $(k; \epsilon)$ . Using this, we can *classify all metallic tubes into two categories: zigzag-like (ZL) and armchair-like (AL) tubes*, with the following bands near the Fermi level (shown on Fig. 2):

$$\text{Zigzag-like: } \epsilon_{km} = v_0 k; \quad m \in m_a; m_b \pmod{n} \quad (4)$$

$$\text{Armchair-like: } \epsilon_k = v_0 (k - k_0); \quad (m = 0): \quad (5)$$

Here  $k \in [-\frac{1}{\mathcal{T}j}; \frac{1}{\mathcal{T}j}]$  is the wave vector along the tube,  $k_0 = \frac{2}{3\mathcal{T}j}$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  is the translational vector generating the translational symmetry. Note that two different tubes can have different  $\mathcal{T}j$  even though they belong to the same category.  $\epsilon = \pm 1$  originates from  $\epsilon_{km}$ , but does not give the sign of the velocity, and for a  $(n; n)$  tube  $\epsilon$  is the parity in the cylindrical angle.<sup>73,74</sup> The linearity of the bands near the Fermi level is, of course, well known, but it is important to recognize the entirely different angular momentum quantum numbers  $m$  that characterize the AL and ZL bands crossing the Fermi level. Specifically, for AL tubes it always holds that  $m = 0$ , while for the ZL tube one has  $m_a = \frac{2n+m}{3} \pmod{n}$  or  $m_b = \frac{2m+n}{3} \pmod{n}$  (note that  $m_a \notin m_b$  and  $m_a, m_b$  are never zero). There is a one-to-one correspondence between  $\epsilon = \pm 1$  and the crystal angular momentum of the linear bands. We note that the most commonly studied metallic zigzag and armchair tubes, with indices  $(3n; 0)$  and  $(n; n)$ , are of course special cases of ZL and AL tubes, respectively.

## III. INTERSHELL COULOMB INTERACTION

We next consider the Coulomb interaction between Bloch states  $|j n_c i\rangle$  for electrons in different shells in a MWCNT. Before calculating the Coulomb matrix element involving products<sup>75</sup> of Bloch states it is useful to consider the less complicated problem of the impurity matrix element  $\langle k n_c^0 | \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{r}) | j n_c i\rangle$ . The essential assumption that we use in calculating both the impurity and Coulomb matrix element is that *the potential is slowly varying on the scale of the interatomic distance  $a_{c-c}$* . In the case of impurity scattering this is a fair assumption

for an impurity held on the tube by Van der Waals forces as is often the case.<sup>76,77</sup> For Coulomb interaction between different shells it is also a good assumption, since the electrons do not get close enough to experience the  $1/r$  singularity.

The impurity matrix element  $\langle \mathbf{k}^0 | \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{r}) | \mathbf{j} \rangle$  between the two component Bloch states  $|\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{r})\rangle$  Eq. (A.5) (before applying periodic boundary conditions) is

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{k}^0 | \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{r}) | \mathbf{j} \rangle &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{R}} \sum_{\mathbf{R}'} e^{i\mathbf{k}^0 \cdot \mathbf{R}' + i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{R}} \\ &\times \int_{\mathbf{R}^0}^{\mathbf{R}} d\mathbf{r} (\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}^0) V(\mathbf{r}) (\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}) \\ &+ \int_{\mathbf{R}^0}^{\mathbf{R}} d\mathbf{r} (\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}^0) V(\mathbf{r}) (\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R} - \mathbf{d}) \\ &+ \int_{\mathbf{R}^0}^{\mathbf{R}} d\mathbf{r} (\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}^0 - \mathbf{d}) V(\mathbf{r}) (\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}) \\ &+ \int_{\mathbf{R}^0}^{\mathbf{R}} d\mathbf{r} (\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}^0 - \mathbf{d}) V(\mathbf{r}) (\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R} - \mathbf{d}) : \quad (6) \end{aligned}$$

By using the assumption of slow variation of  $V(\mathbf{r})$  we can take the potential outside the integrals. The first and last term in the square bracket become  $\int_{\mathbf{R}^0}^{\mathbf{R}} V(\mathbf{R}) (\mathbf{k}^0 - \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}^0 - \mathbf{k})$  and the second and third term are found (including a sum) by summing over the nearest neighbors to be  $\int_{\mathbf{R}^0}^{\mathbf{R}} S_0 (\mathbf{k}^0 - \mathbf{k}) (\mathbf{k}^0) + \int_{\mathbf{R}^0}^{\mathbf{R}} (\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}^0) (\mathbf{k})$ . Eq. (A.7) defines

$\langle \mathbf{k} \rangle$ . Introducing the Fourier transform of the potential  $V(\mathbf{k})$  and the reciprocal lattice vector  $\mathbf{G}$  we find:

$$\langle \mathbf{k}^0 | \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{r}) | \mathbf{j} \rangle = g(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{k}^0) \frac{1}{A} \sum_{\mathbf{G}} V(\mathbf{k}^0 - \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{G}); \quad (7)$$

where  $A$  is the surface area and the  $g$ -factor is

$$g(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{k}^0) = \frac{\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}^0 + \mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}^0}{S_0 (\mathbf{k}^0 - \mathbf{k}) (\mathbf{k}^0) + \int_{\mathbf{R}^0}^{\mathbf{R}} (\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}^0) (\mathbf{k})}; \quad (8)$$

i.e. the matrix element is essentially the plane wave result *times a band structure factor, which we will refer to as the  $g$ -factor*.

To obtain the matrix element for the screened Coulomb interaction  $V(\mathbf{r}_1; \mathbf{r}_2)$  (suppressing the frequency argument ! in the notation) we note that  $\langle \mathbf{k}_1^0 \mathbf{k}_2^0 | \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{r}_1; \mathbf{r}_2) | \mathbf{j}_1 \mathbf{k}_2 \rangle = \langle \mathbf{k}_2^0 | \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{r}_1; \mathbf{r}_2) | \mathbf{j}_1 \mathbf{k}_2 \rangle$ , where  $i = 1, 2$  labels the outer/inner tube, respectively. Therefore we can use the impurity potential result Eq. (7) to obtain:

$$\langle \mathbf{k}_1^0 \mathbf{k}_2^0 | \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{r}_1; \mathbf{r}_2) | \mathbf{j}_1 \mathbf{k}_2 \rangle = g_1(\mathbf{k}_1; \mathbf{k}_1^0) g_2(\mathbf{k}_2; \mathbf{k}_2^0) \frac{1}{A_1 A_2} \sum_{\mathbf{G}_1, \mathbf{G}_2} V(\mathbf{k}_1^0 - \mathbf{k}_1 + \mathbf{G}_1; \mathbf{k}_2^0 - \mathbf{k}_2 + \mathbf{G}_2); \quad (9)$$

where we have a  $g$ -factor for each system and the screened potential is Fourier transformed separately in both  $\mathbf{r}_1$  and  $\mathbf{r}_2$ .

For a  $(n_2; m_2)$  tube inside a  $(n_1; m_1)$  tube the screened Coulomb matrix element is found using cylindrical coordinates  $\mathbf{r} = (r; \theta; z)$  to be

$$\langle \mathbf{k}_1^0 n_{c_1}^0 \mathbf{k}_2^0 n_{c_2}^0 | \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{r}_1; \mathbf{r}_2) | \mathbf{j}_1 n_{c_1} \mathbf{k}_2 n_{c_2} \rangle = \frac{1}{(2L)^2} g_1(\mathbf{k}_1 n_{c_1}; \mathbf{k}_1^0 n_{c_1}^0) g_2(\mathbf{k}_2 n_{c_2}; \mathbf{k}_2^0 n_{c_2}^0) \sum_{\mathbf{G}_1, \mathbf{G}_2} \sum_{u_1, u_2} V(\mathbf{k}_1^0 - \mathbf{k}_1 + \mathbf{G}_1; m_1^0 - m_1 + n_1 u_1; \mathbf{k}_2^0 - \mathbf{k}_2 + \mathbf{G}_2; m_2^0 - m_2 + n_2 u_2; \mathbf{r}_1; \mathbf{r}_2); \quad (10)$$

where  $L$  is the length of tubes,  $n_i = \gcd(n_i; m_i)$ ,  $G_i = \frac{2\pi}{L} s (s \in \mathbb{Z})$ ,  $r_i$  is the radius<sup>78</sup> of tube  $i$ .

We will also need the unscreened Coulomb matrix element  $V^0$ , which is a function of the interparticle distance  $|\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2|$  i.e. a function of  $z_1 - z_2$ ,  $r_1$  and  $r_2$ , so we Fourier transform in the differences  $z_1 - z_2$  and  $r_1 - r_2$ .

Therefore the matrix element is:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{k}_1^0 n_{c_1}^0 \mathbf{k}_2^0 n_{c_2}^0 | \mathcal{V}^0(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2) | \mathbf{j}_1 n_{c_1} \mathbf{k}_2 n_{c_2} \rangle &= \\ \frac{1}{2L} g_1(\mathbf{k}_1 n_{c_1}; \mathbf{k}_1^0 n_{c_1}^0) g_2(\mathbf{k}_2 n_{c_2}; \mathbf{k}_2^0 n_{c_2}^0) &\sum_{\mathbf{G}_1, \mathbf{G}_2} \sum_{u_1, u_2} V^0(\mathbf{k}_1^0 - \mathbf{k}_1 + \mathbf{G}_1; m_1^0 - m_1 + n_1 u_1; \mathbf{r}_1; \mathbf{r}_2) \\ &\times V^0(\mathbf{k}_2^0 - \mathbf{k}_2 + \mathbf{G}_2; m_2^0 - m_2 + n_2 u_2; \mathbf{r}_1; \mathbf{r}_2); \quad (11) \end{aligned}$$

Note that the  $\mathbf{r}$  in the states Eq. (A.11) (the  $\mathbf{r}$  index for metallic states Eq. (2-3)) is suppressed in the notation and that *this index only appears in the  $g$ -factors* in both

Eq. (10) and Eq. (11). Here we have used the crystal angular momentum difference in the Fourier transforms instead of the  $n_c$  difference, since this is the physical (crystal) angular momentum being transferred.<sup>79</sup> Note that we have included Umklapp scattering and that the unscreened interaction Eq. (11) has crystal (angular) momentum conservation. Similar matrix element were considered by S. Uryu.<sup>44</sup>

### A. The $g$ -factor and backscattering in metallic tubes

We now consider the  $g$ -factors and show that they contain essential information about the electronic scattering. The  $g$ -factor for any  $(n; m)$  metallic tube for the scattering process  $(k; \xi) \rightarrow (k'; \xi')$  between the metallic states Eq. (3) is found by inserting Eq. (A.10) (with  $K = K_T \frac{T}{T_F}$ ) and Eq. (3) into Eq. (8):

$$g(k; \xi; k'; \xi') = \frac{1}{2} \left( \langle \xi | \hat{H}_{nm} | \xi' \rangle + 1 \right) s_0 \frac{\bar{p}_{3a} (K_T^0 + K_T)}{4}; \quad (12)$$

where we introduced

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \xi | \hat{H}_{nm} | \xi' \rangle = & \langle \xi | \xi' \rangle \frac{n^2 + m^2 + 4mn}{2(n^2 + m^2 + mn)} (1 - \langle \xi | \xi' \rangle) \\ & + i \frac{\bar{p}_{3a} (m^2 - n^2)}{2(n^2 + m^2 + mn)} (1 - \langle \xi | \xi' \rangle); \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

The  $g$ -factor in Eq. (12) has two terms: The first parentheses is the important wave vector independent scalar-product of  $\langle \xi | \xi' \rangle$  from Eq. (3) and the second term is a wave vector dependent correction term (of first order in  $s_0 \rightarrow 0$ ).

As we shall show in section IV, only backscattering contributes to the Coulomb drag in metallic tubes and we therefore need to consider all possible backscattering processes ( $\xi = \xi'$ ) in any metallic tube.

Due to the double degeneracy of the zigzag-like bands Eq. (4) at the Fermi level, we must consider backscattering both with and without crystal momentum exchange (Fig. 3, center and left panels, respectively).

If  $\xi = \xi'$  then  $m = m'$  and  $m = 0$  and from Eq. (12) we have

$$g(k; \xi; k'; \xi) = s_0 \frac{\bar{p}_{3a} k^0}{4}; \quad (14)$$

which is of order  $10^{-2}$  or less for scattering around the Fermi level, i.e. for  $k^0 = k' \frac{2T_F}{v_0}$  the  $g$ -factor is  $g = s_0 \frac{T_F}{v_0} \cdot 10^{-2}$  for  $T_F \cdot 0.3 \text{ eV}$ . If  $\xi = \xi'$  then  $j = j'$  and  $j = 0$  and for backscattering around the Fermi




FIG. 3: The possible backscattering processes in *any* metallic tube with a slightly raised Fermi level  $\mu_F$ . (Left): Backscattering in a zigzag-like tube *without* crystal angular momentum change  $m = 0$  (i.e.  $\xi = \xi'$ ) and a small wave vector  $k^0 = k' \frac{2T_F}{v_0}$  change, which is suppressed by  $g \sim 10^{-2}$  from Eq. (14). (Center): Backscattering in a zigzag-like tube *with* crystal angular momentum change, which have  $g \sim 1$  from Eq. (15). Here  $\bar{m}$  denotes the opposite of  $m$  in the set  $\{m_a, m_b\}$ . (Right): Two types of backscattering in armchair-like tubes: (i) A large wave vector transfer (for  $\xi = \xi'$ ) in between states with the same crystal angular momentum ( $m = 0$ ) and  $g \sim 1$  (Eq. (15)) and (ii) A small wave vector transfer  $q \sim \frac{2T_F}{3v_0}$  suppressed by  $g \sim 10^{-2}$ . Note that the distance between the points  $\frac{2T_F}{3v_0}$  are not to scale (i.e.  $\frac{2T_F}{3v_0} = \frac{4}{3j}$ ) and that the armchair-like bands are connected as in Fig. 2.

level the  $g$ -factor squared is:<sup>80</sup>

$$g^2 = \left( \frac{1}{4} + \frac{n^2 + m^2 + 4mn}{2(n^2 + m^2 + mn)} \right)^2 + \frac{3}{16} \frac{m^2 - n^2}{n^2 + m^2 + mn}^2; \quad (15)$$

which is  $\frac{3}{4}$  for  $(n; 0)$ , 1 for  $(n; n)$  and in between for all other tubes. *So in a zigzag-like tube we have two kinds of backscattering with small crystal wave vector exchange*  $q \sim \frac{2T_F}{3v_0}$  (and thereby large  $V(q; m)$ ): *Either*  $m = 0$  and  $g \sim 10^{-2}$  *or*  $m \neq 0$  and  $g \sim 1$ . Note that the larger the  $m$  the smaller  $V(q; m)$ . Even though  $V(q; m)$  is large the small  $g$ -factor suppresses the  $m = 0$  backscattering.

Consider now armchair-like tubes where the bands crossing  $\mu_F = 0$  all have  $m = 0$ , so the small crystal wave vector transfer around  $\frac{2T_F}{3v_0}$  have  $\xi = \xi'$  and therefore the  $g$  factor is the same as in Eq. (14), i.e.  $g \sim 10^{-2}$  suppresses this kind of backscattering (Fig. 3(right)). If we on the other hand have a large crystal wave vector transfer backscattering (Fig. 3(right)), then  $\xi = \xi'$  and the  $g$ -factor of order 1 from Eq. (15) is used. So the large crystal wave vector backscattering is most important, since the Fourier transform does not grow enough to compensate for the small  $g$ -factor.

Ando *et al.*<sup>68,69</sup> have used the  $k \rightarrow p$  approximation to consider backscattering (from impurities) in metallic tubes and found a result similar to Eq. (8), but without the  $s_0$  term. The small wave vector transfer backscattering was found to be small in these papers. Klesse<sup>70</sup> has found similar results for scattering in nanotubes, see also [15] for some experimental evidence of lack of backscattering in metallic tubes compared to semicon-



momentum and/or parity (for armchair tubes) conservation and  $F_{i,i}^{(i)}(\mathbf{q};!)$  is the available  $(\mathbf{q};!)$ -phase space for scattering in the  $i$ th tube given by

$$F_{i,i}^{(i)}(\mathbf{q};!) = \frac{e_{i,i}}{2} \frac{X}{T_{Tr}} \text{sign}(\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}_s} \cdot \mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}_s + \mathbf{q}}) \quad (22)$$

$$[f^0(\mathbf{k}_s) - f^0(\mathbf{k}_s + \mathbf{q})] \mu_i(\mathbf{k}_s; \mathbf{k}_s + \mathbf{q}) f^0(\mathbf{k}_s)$$

where the  $\mathbf{k}_s$  are the solutions to  $\mathbf{k}_i = \mathbf{k}_s + \mathbf{q}$  in the FBZ of subsystem  $i$ ,  $\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}} = \frac{1}{\hbar} \frac{\partial \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}}{\partial \mathbf{k}}$  is the velocity,  $\text{sign}(\mathbf{x})$  gives the sign of  $\mathbf{x}$  (if  $\mathbf{x} = 0$  then  $\text{sign}(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ ) and  $\mu_{Tr}^{(i)}$  is the transport mobility, which is a single subsystem property. Note that the  $F$ -function is periodic and odd in  $\mathbf{q}$ .

Having stated this formula a few comments and interpretations are in order.

Firstly, we note that *only backscattering processes contribute to the drag between metallic tubes* in the linearized band models Eq. (4) and Eq. (5), since we only have two velocities  $\mathbf{v}_0 = \frac{3}{2} \frac{v_F a}{\hbar}$  in the metallic bands and therefore the sign-function of the velocity difference before and after the scattering event in the  $F$ -function Eq. (22) makes only backscattering (i.e.  $\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}_s} = -\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{k}_s + \mathbf{q}}$ ) contribute to the  $F$ -function. In section III A we therefore analyzed the  $g$ -factors for all possible backscattering processes in metallic tubes. The interaction and  $\sinh^2 \frac{1}{2k_B T}$  are decreasing functions of  $q$  and  $!$ , respectively, so the importance of the phase space (i.e. the  $F$ -functions) in the integral decreases from the origin. It is worth to note that the forward scattering contribution which for quadratic dispersion relation dominates at higher temperatures,<sup>86</sup> thus plays no role here. If we included a curvature of the dispersion relation for the nanotubes, we would get a correction to the results presented here. However, there is one subtlety hidden in this, because if we consider Coulomb drag between short tubes, where the distribution functions are not relaxed to the Galilean invariant form assumed in [86], but is instead given by a two-step distribution function, the forward scattering does not contribute to the Coulomb drag as shown in [87].

Secondly, we have used a quantum number independent impurity relaxation time  $\tau_i$  for each subsystem in Eq. (18) and Eq. (19). The mobility  $\mu_{Tr}^{(i)}$  can be shown to be proportional to  $\tau_i$ , i.e.  $\mu_{Tr}^{(i)} \propto \tau_i$ , from a single subsystem Boltzmann equation (like Eq. (18)). Therefore the  $F$ -function Eq. (22) is  $\tau_i$  independent, so the *transresistance  $R_{21}$  is independent of the impurity relaxation times*. So in the quasi-ballistic regime for large  $\tau_i$  the transresistance is still formally correct. However, there has been some work on drag between ballistic 1D systems with free electron like bands using Boltzmann equations, where almost identical transresistance formula is found.<sup>88</sup>

As a last comment, we note that Umklapp scattering is only possible if the tubes are commensurable due to the  $G_1, G_2$  function in Eq. (21) as also found in ref. [82].




FIG. 4: The transresistance per length  $\frac{R_{21}}{L}$  (in  $\Omega/\mu\text{m}$ ) as a function of the Fermi level  $\epsilon_F$  (in eV) (e.g. a gate voltage). The temperature is:  $T = 80\text{K}$  (dotted),  $T = 150\text{K}$  (dashed) and  $T = 300\text{K}$  (full line). The dip in  $R_{21}$  at  $\epsilon_F = 0$  reflects the electron-hole symmetry at this point. (Inset): A sketch of the situation for misaligned Fermi levels (see text).

## V. ELECTRON-HOLE SYMMETRY AND COULOMB DRAG

All nanotubes have an inherited electron-hole symmetry from the graphene band structure for  $\epsilon_F = 0$ , which intuitively means that there are as many electrons as holes for  $\epsilon_F = 0$  (for the precise definition see [89]; for a recent measurement of electron-hole symmetry see [13]). So there will be an equal amount of momentum transfer to (from) the electrons and holes and therefore no voltage difference will arise, i.e.  $R_{21} = 0$ , if one of the subsystems has electron-hole symmetry. Formally, the  $F$ -function can be seen to vanish at electron-hole symmetry by using  $f^0(\epsilon) = 1 - f^0(\epsilon)$  (after doing the sum over the band indices), where  $\epsilon$  is the chemical potential. This has also been used to show how  $R_{21}$  can change sign.<sup>82</sup>

Therefore, we predict that *by varying the Fermi levels (either by gate voltage or doping) a dip (or peak) in  $R_{21}$  will appear due to the electron-hole symmetry for all kinds of tube combinations*. For two concentric armchair tubes  $(5;5)$  in  $(10;10)$  the transresistance as a function of  $\epsilon_F$  is shown on Fig. 4 (the range of  $\epsilon_F$  is chosen to correspond to typical experiments<sup>6,76,77,90,91,92</sup>). Note that we use the simplification of having the same Fermi level in the two tubes in the numerical calculation, but the situation for misaligned Fermi levels is sketched in the inset of Fig. 4. As indicated in the inset, we have the following scenario for increasing gate voltage for  $\epsilon_F^{(1)} \notin \epsilon_F^{(2)}$ : First hole-hole ( $h-h$ ) scattering, then one subsystem passes electron-hole symmetry, i.e.  $R_{21} = 0$ , afterwards  $e-h$  scattering until the other subsystem also passes through

the electron-hole symmetry point. The details of the calculation are given below in section VI A.

## VI. COULOMB DRAG BETWEEN METALLIC TUBES

### A. Drag between (real) armchair tubes

Let us begin by calculating the transresistance Eq. (21) between two concentric real (i.e.  $(n;n)$ ) armchair nanotubes, which have  $\mathcal{F} = a$  independent of  $n$ . The band index is in this case the index  $i = 1$  from Eq. (5). To find the  $F^{(i)}_0(q; \omega)$  functions Eq. (22) we need the solutions of  $\epsilon_k - \epsilon_{k+q} = 0$  with the bands Eq. (5) and remembering that  $\epsilon_k$  should be made  $\frac{2}{\mathcal{F}ij}$  periodic by hand (in order to find two solutions and not only one). The sign function only gives backscattering, which is expressed by step functions. For intraband backscattering  $\omega = 0$  we have  $q = 1$  (Eq. (15)) and for interband backscattering  $\omega = 0$  we have  $\mathcal{F}j^2 = s_0^2 \frac{3(aq)^2}{16}$  (Eq. (14)) as found in section III A. Therefore the  $F$ -functions are<sup>80</sup> for  $0 < q < \frac{2\pi}{\mathcal{F}ij}$ :

$$F^{(i)}_0(q; \omega) = C_F^{(i)} (\omega + v_0 q) \quad (23)$$

$$f^0(\mu_1) = f^0(\mu_2 - \frac{1}{2}k_0)v_0 + f^0(\mu_2) = f^0(\mu_1 - \frac{1}{2}k_0)v_0$$

with  $\mu_1 = \frac{1}{2}(\omega + v_0 q - 2v_0 k_0)$  and  $\mu_2 = \frac{1}{2}(\omega - v_0 q + v_0 k_0)$ ,

$$F_{++}^{(i)}(q; \omega) = C_F^{(i)} (\omega + v_0 q) \quad (24)$$

$$f^0(\mu_1) = f^0(\mu_2 + \frac{1}{2}k_0)v_0 + f^0(\mu_2) = f^0(\mu_1 + \frac{1}{2}k_0)v_0$$

with  $\mu_1 = \frac{1}{2}(\omega + v_0 q - v_0 k_0)$  and  $\mu_2 = \frac{1}{2}(\omega - v_0 q + 2v_0 k_0)$ ,

$$F_{+-}^{(i)}(q; \omega) = C_F^{(i)} s_0^2 \frac{3(aq)^2}{16} (\omega - v_0 q + v_0 k_0) \quad (25)$$

$$f^0(\mu_1^0) = f^0(\mu_2^0) + f^0(\mu_2^0) = f^0(\mu_1^0)$$

and

$$F_{+-}^{(i)}(q; \omega) = C_F^{(i)} s_0^2 \frac{3(aq)^2}{16} (\omega - v_0 q + v_0 k_0) \quad (26)$$

$$f^0(\mu_1^0) = f^0(\mu_2^0) + f^0(\mu_2^0) = f^0(\mu_1^0);$$

where  $\mu_1^0 = \frac{1}{2}(\omega + v_0 q)$  and  $\mu_2^0 = \frac{1}{2}(\omega - v_0 q)$  and we have calculated the common single subsystem prefactor

$$C_F^{(i)} = \frac{\epsilon_{i-1}}{j^2} \frac{1}{T_r} = \frac{2\epsilon_F + v_0 \frac{2}{\mathcal{F}ij}}{2(jv_0)^2} \quad (27)$$




FIG. 5: Contour plot of the  $F$  functions for the intraband scattering for  $0 < q < \frac{2\pi}{\mathcal{F}ij}$ ,  $\epsilon_F > 0$  and the temperature  $T = 0.1T_F$ . Note the smearing by the Fermi functions due to the temperature on some edges and the sharp edge at  $\omega = v_0 q$  from the step function ( $\omega = v_0 q$ ).

It is important to note that the interband  $F$ -functions,  $F_{+-}$  and  $F_{-+}$ , are heavily suppressed compared to the intraband  $F$ -functions (shown in Fig. 5) by  $\mathcal{F}j^2 = s_0^2 \frac{3(aq)^2}{16}$  of order  $\sim 10^{-4}$  for backscattering around the Fermi level. Therefore, including the tight-binding states in the Coulomb matrix element and not just in the available phase space for scattering as in Ref. [93] is a very important effect.

In real armchair tubes the index is a parity index in the cylindrical coordinate<sup>73,74</sup> and therefore the Coulomb matrix element has the property:

$$hk_1^0 k_2^0 \mathcal{V}(r_1; r_2) j_1 k_1 - j_2 k_2 i = \mathcal{V}(r_1; r_2) j_1 k_1 - j_2 k_2 i \quad (28)$$

i.e. *the product of the parity is conserved in the interaction*. Since both  $i = 1$  have  $m = 0$  there is no angular momentum selection rule, so the only selection rule  $J$  in Eq. (21) is  $J = (j_1 - j_2; k_1 - k_2) = (j_1 - j_2; k_1 - k_2)$ , which reduces the number of terms by a factor of two. Since  $\mathcal{V}(q; m)$  is parity independent in Eq. (21), then the sum over band indices for  $\mathcal{F}ij = \mathcal{F}2j$  is:

$$\sum_{i,j} F_{++}^{(i)} F_{--}^{(j)} = F_{++}^{(1)} F_{--}^{(1)} + F_{+-}^{(1)} F_{-+}^{(1)} + F_{+-}^{(2)} F_{-+}^{(2)} + F_{-+}^{(1)} F_{++}^{(1)} + F_{-+}^{(2)} F_{++}^{(2)} = (F_{\text{intra}})^2 + (F_{\text{inter}})^2; \quad (29)$$

which defines the inter and intraband  $F$  functions.  $(F_{\text{inter}})^2$  is of fourth order in  $s_0 q$  and therefore strongly suppressed compared to  $F_{\text{intra}}$  even though  $F_{\text{inter}}$  has phase space for smaller  $q$  and  $\omega$ .  $F_{\text{intra}}(q; \omega)$  is shown on Fig. 6.

We now have all the ingredients of the transresistance  $R_{21}$ :

$$\frac{R_{21}}{L} = \frac{j^2}{e^2 n_1 n_2 k_B T} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{r_1 r_2} \int_0^{\omega} d\omega \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{d\omega} \left( \frac{j_{12}(q; \omega; i!)}{\sinh^2 \frac{\omega}{2k_B T}} \right) (F_{\text{intra}}(q; \omega))^2 + (F_{\text{inter}}(q; \omega))^2; \quad (30)$$

A numerical integration yields  $R_{21}$  as a function of  $\epsilon_F$  and the temperature  $T$ , shown on Figs. 4 and 7, respectively. The transresistance per length  $\frac{R_{21}}{L}$  is of the order






FIG. 6: Contour plot of the  $F_{\text{intra}}$  function.  $F_{\text{intra}}$  gives the phase space for intraband scattering in (real) armchair tubes.  $F_{\text{intra}}$  is seen for  $0 < q < \frac{2\pi}{a}$  and is odd in  $q$  and should be repeated periodically with  $\frac{2\pi}{a}$  as a function of  $q$ .




FIG. 7: The transresistance per length  $\frac{R_{21}}{L}$  (in units of  $\Omega/\mu\text{m}$ ) versus temperature  $T$  (or  $T=T_F$  (left)). The curves are obtained from a numerical integration of eq.(30) for a (5;5) in a (10;10) tube. Curves for four different Fermi levels  $\mu_F$  (i.e. gate voltages or dopings) are seen:  $\mu_F = 0.006\text{eV}$  ( $T_F = 69\text{K}$ ) (left, dashed line),  $\mu_F = 0.015\text{eV}$  ( $T_F = 174\text{K}$ ) (left, full line),  $\mu_F = 0.15\text{eV}$  ( $T_F = 1740\text{K}$ ) (right, dashed line) and  $\mu_F = 0.3\text{eV}$  (right, full line). Note the difference in magnitude between the transresistances  $R_{21}$ .

a few  $\mu\text{m}$ .  $R_{21}$  is seen to be linear in  $T$  for  $T \lesssim 0.4T_F$  as also found for free electron like bands.<sup>94</sup> For higher temperatures the transresistance increases or decreases depending on the Fermi level. Numerically, we find a factor of  $10^6$  difference between the contribution to  $R_{21}$  from  $F_{\text{inter}}$  and  $F_{\text{intra}}$ , so we can conclude that *the drag is due to the intraband backscattering processes*. The largest contribution to the integral is around  $q = k_0 - \frac{2\mu_F}{\hbar v_0}$  (see Fig. 6), which corresponds to Umklapp scattering processes around the Fermi level, e.g.  $k = k_0 - \frac{\mu_F}{\hbar v_0}$  and  $k^0 = k_0 + \frac{\mu_F}{\hbar v_0}$  so  $q = k^0 - k + \frac{2\mu_F}{\hbar v_0} = k_0 + \frac{2\mu_F}{\hbar v_0}$ .

Note that screening induced by the substrate could change the magnitude of the transresistance a small amount, which could be modelled<sup>20</sup> by introducing a new dielectric constant  $\epsilon_r$  instead of  $\epsilon_0$  in Eq. (B.15) with  $\epsilon_r$  about 1 to 3.<sup>95</sup> For the present case, the magnitude of  $R_{21}$  is changed  $\sim 10\%$ , when  $\epsilon_r$  is increased from 1 to 3.

The transresistance depends on the radii of the tubes only via the bare Coulomb interaction Eq. (B.15). Fig. 8 shows that  $R_{21}$  decreases exponentially (for  $n \gtrsim 25$ ) when keeping the inner armchair tube at a fixed radius and increasing the outer tube radius. For parallel 2DEG's  $R_{21}$  was found to depend on the separation  $d$  as<sup>55</sup>  $R_{21} \propto d^4$ .




FIG. 8: The transresistance per length  $\frac{R_{21}}{L}$  versus radius ( $r/n$ ) for armchair tubes. The different outer and inner armchair tubes are: A (5;5) in a (n;n) (dots), a (6;6) in a (n;n) (triangles) and a (9;9) in a (n;n) (stars). The radius of the outer tube is:  $r = \frac{3a}{2}n$  for a (n;n) tube. Here  $T = 300\text{K}$  and  $\mu_F = 0.3\text{eV}$  is used. Note the logarithmic scale.

## B. Drag between armchair-like tubes

For two general armchair-like tubes, we do not have a parity selection rule and in general  $\mathfrak{T}_{1j} \notin \mathfrak{T}_{2j}$  as seen in Table I. Therefore we have no selection rules, but all other terms than  $F_{++}^{(1)} F_{00}^{(2)}$  are of higher order in  $(s_0 q)^2$  and therefore small, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathfrak{T}_{1j}^{(1)} \mathfrak{T}_{2j}^{(2)} + F_{++}^{(1)} F_{++}^{(2)} + F_{++}^{(1)} F_{00}^{(2)} + F_{00}^{(1)} F_{++}^{(2)} + F_{00}^{(1)} F_{00}^{(2)} + \mathcal{O}((s_0 q)^2) \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

as for the (real) armchair tube case Eq. (29). The  $F_{++}^{(i)}$  and  $F_{00}^{(i)}$  are the same as found in section VIA and shown in Fig. 5 except that  $a$  is replaced by  $\mathfrak{T}_{1j}$  (but not in the  $g$ -factor).

Since  $\mathfrak{T}_{1j}$  and  $\mathfrak{T}_{2j}$  are different (in general), it is harder to conserve (crystal) momentum near the Fermi level for the dominant backscattering process with momentum transfer  $q' = k_0^{(i)} - \frac{2\mu_F}{\hbar v_0}$  with  $k_0^{(i)} = \frac{2\mu_F}{3\mathfrak{T}_{1j}}$ . However, for some values of  $\mathfrak{T}_{1j}$  and  $\mathfrak{T}_{2j}$  it is possible to conserve momentum near the Fermi level, which gives rise to peaks in  $R_{21}$  e.g. at  $\frac{\mathfrak{T}_{1j}}{\mathfrak{T}_{2j}} = 1$  as seen in Fig. 9. The peaks on both sides of  $\frac{\mathfrak{T}_{1j}}{\mathfrak{T}_{2j}} = 1$  are

$$\frac{\mathfrak{T}_{2j}}{\mathfrak{T}_{1j}} \frac{\mathfrak{T}_{1j}}{\mathfrak{T}_{2j}} = \frac{6\mu_F}{\hbar v_0} \quad (32)$$

corresponding to  $k_0^{(1)} - \frac{2\mu_F}{\hbar v_0} = k_0^{(2)} - \frac{2\mu_F}{\hbar v_0}$  (see inset (a) in Fig. 9). These peaks have  $R_{21} < 0$ , since they correspond to a resonance between a electron-like and a hole-like backscattering in the sense that a hole-like (electron-like) backscattering takes place in a hole-like (electron-like) band with  $\text{sign}(v_k) = -\text{sign}(k)$  ( $\text{sign}(v_k) = \text{sign}(k)$ ) in the FBZ. The peaks around  $\frac{\mathfrak{T}_{1j}}{\mathfrak{T}_{2j}} = \frac{1}{2}$  and 2 are found in the same way by taking the backscattering processes  $q' = 2k_0^{(i)} - \frac{2\mu_F}{\hbar v_0}$  into account. If the radii of the tubes are different, then the magnitude of  $R_{21}$  will change (see Fig. 8), but the signs and positions of the peaks are the same. The peaks are broadened by increasing temperature and the positions of the peaks depend on  $\mu_F$  as seen e.g. from Eq. (32) (except for  $\frac{\mathfrak{T}_{1j}}{\mathfrak{T}_{2j}} = \frac{1}{2}, 1$  and 2). The




FIG. 9: The transresistance per length  $\frac{R_{21}}{L}$  as a function of the ratio of the translational vectors length  $|T_1|/|T_2|$  for two armchair-like tubes. The peaks corresponding to different scattering processes are seen as explained in the text. Numerically, we use  $|T_2| = a$ , radii as for a (5;5) in an (10;10) tube,  $T = 300K$  and  $\epsilon_F = 0.3eV$ . If the tubes have a different radius, only the magnitude of the peak is changed, see Fig. 8. (Inset (a)): The scattering processes in tube 1 and 2 leading to the peak at  $|T_1|/|T_2| = 1/2$ . Note that the backscattering processes are electron-like and hole-like, respectively, so  $R_{21} < 0$ . (Inset (b)): Peaks around  $|T_1|/|T_2| = 1/2$ . Note the difference in scale.

situation of varying  $|T_1|$  and  $|T_2|$  is similar to varying the densities in the parallel 2D systems.<sup>81</sup> Note that if we have a tube configuration corresponding to a negative dip in Fig. 9 ( $R_{21} < 0$ ), then this tube configuration will have a peak instead of a dip as a function of the gate voltage.

Summarizing, Coulomb drag between armchair-like tubes is strongly dependent on the magnitude of the translational vectors  $|T_1|$  and  $|T_2|$  and can lead to both negative and positive transresistance.

### C. Drag between zigzag-like tubes

Consider the drag between two zigzag-like tubes, where the index is  $m = 1$  and  $m = 2$  from Eq. (4). The backscattering F-function,  $F_m^{(i)}$ , has a form similar to  $F_m^{(i)}$  for armchair-like tubes (Eq. (25) and (26)), where the important part is the backscattering around the small  $q' = \frac{2\epsilon_F}{v_0}$ . This backscattering can be both with ( $m \neq 0$ ) and without ( $m = 0$ ) exchange of crystal angular momentum with the g-factors

$$\mathcal{F}(m=0)j^2 / (s_0 a q)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{F}(m \neq 0)j^2 \propto 1 \quad (33)$$

found in section III A. Since there is crystal angular momentum conservation<sup>96</sup> it depends on the combination of the zigzag-like tubes (and their  $m_a$  and  $m_b$ ) whether the  $m \neq 0$  backscattering is possible or not, so we have *two very different cases*:

1. If  $m \neq 0$  is not possible, then only  $m = 0$  backscattering for  $q' = \frac{2\epsilon_F}{v_0}$  is present, but this is strongly suppressed by the small g-factor and so is the drag. So in this case the small wave vector transfer forward scattering (for non-linearized bands) could become important, but in any case the effect is small. An example is the drag between two (real) metallic zigzag tubes (see table I).

2. If  $m \neq 0$  is possible, then this process is the dominant, even though there is a small suppression (compared to the g-factor) from having  $m \neq 0$  in the Fourier transform  $V_{12}(q; m; !)$ , which is smaller the larger  $m$ . An example is a (12;15) in a (15;18), which has an angular momentum exchange of  $m = 1$ .

Furthermore, there are no peaks in  $R_{21}$  as a function of  $\frac{|T_1|}{|T_2|}$  as for the armchair-like tubes, since the transferred crystal wave vector  $q' = \frac{2\epsilon_F}{v_0}$  is independent of  $|T_1|$ .

From the same principles as used above, we find the drag between zigzag-like and armchair-like tubes to be strongly suppressed.

## VII. COMMENTS ON THE DRAG BETWEEN SEMICONDUCTING TUBES

If the Fermi level for a semiconducting tube is shifted into the conduction (or valence) band, then the drag processes are within a single band (i.e.  $m = 0$ ) similar to a quadratic band for small tubes, where there are few bands with large separation. Here both the small  $q$  forward scattering and the large  $q$  backscattering processes will contribute to the drag. We can calculate the g factors in the same way as for the metallic tubes and for intra-band scattering they are of order one. However, the magnitude of the backscattering momentum transfer around the Fermi level has to be approximately the same in the two tubes in order to satisfy momentum conservation. In general, this is *not* the case.

If we deal with *larger tubes* more bands can come into play and thereby more scattering possibilities appear than captured in the single band quadratic model (see ref. [70] for a discussion on scattering in larger MWCNT's). This is also the case of larger metallic tubes. Coulomb drag in the quadratic model with more bands (with different angular momentum along the tube) for tubes of semiconducting material are considered in ref. [97].

## VIII. SUMMARY

We have considered the intershell resistance  $R_{21}$  originating from the intershell Coulomb interaction neglecting tunnelling, i.e. in a Coulomb drag configuration.

For any tube combination we predict a dip or peak in  $R_{21}$  as a function of gate voltage, which should be experimentally observable. The dip (or peak) is due to

the *electron-hole symmetry* of the carbon nanotube band structure. Whether  $R_{21}$  has a dip or peak depends on the sign of  $R_{21}$ , when both systems have Fermi levels above the electron-hole symmetry point.

The *order of magnitude* and *sign* of  $R_{21}$  were found to depend crucially on the chirality and Fermi level mismatching of the two tubes. The magnitude of  $R_{21}$  can reach  $50 = m$  under favorable circumstances. The origin of the drastic change in magnitude between different chiralities is the suppressed backscattering due to the Coulomb matrix element between Bloch states combined with the mismatching of wave vector and crystal angular momentum conservation near the Fermi level.  $R_{21}$  was found to be linear in temperature for low temperatures (compared to  $T_F$ ), just as for a single quadratic band. To facilitate the analysis, we classified *all* metallic tubes in two categories: zigzag-like or armchair-like, and described their crystal angular momentum properties.

Throughout the paper, we use Fermi liquid theory to describe the Coulomb drag in the MWCNT's, which gives a benchmark result for comparison to future experiments and Luttinger liquid theories of drag in MWCNT's. The effects considered in this paper should be helpful in interpreting future measurements of the intershell resistance.

### Acknowledgements

We thank Mads Brandbyge for several very useful discussions on the carbon nanotube band structure and Reinhold Egger for a discussion on the problem on the intershell resistance. Furthermore, Laurits Højgaard Olesen is acknowledged for his help on numerical problems. Jesper Nygård, Birte Rasmussen and Peter Bøggild have given several useful comments on the experimental realization of Coulomb drag in multiwall carbon nanotubes. Anna A. Jensen and Morten H. Larsen are acknowledged for discussions of an algebraic nature. A helpful comment from T. Vukovic is also appreciated.

## APPENDIX A: ENERGY BAND STRUCTURE OF THE CARBON NANOTUBES

We will now give a rather detailed discussion of the band structure of carbon nanotubes, since the intershell Coulomb interaction matrix element turns out to depend critically on the Bloch states of the two tubes due to the two atom primitive unit cell (of a graphite layer) as seen in section III.

The carbon nanotube lattice can be thought of as a wrapping (i.e. a conformal mapping) of a graphite layer into a tube. The wrapping is preformed such that the chiral vector  $C = na_1 + ma_2$  becomes the circumferential of the  $(n;m)$  nanotube and this determines the lattice completely.<sup>98,99</sup> (Here  $a_1 = \frac{a}{2}(\sqrt{3}; 1)$  and  $a_2 = \frac{a}{2}(\sqrt{3}; 1)$  are graphene lattice vectors and  $a = \frac{1}{3}a_{c-c}$ , where  $a_{c-c}$  is the inter atomic distance).

Any  $(n;m)$  nanotube has three symmetries: A discrete translational symmetry along the tube, a discrete rotational symmetry around the tube axis and a helical symmetry (i.e. a screw operation). These symmetries give rise to the three corresponding quantum numbers:  $k$  (crystal wave vector along the tube),  $m$  (the crystal angular momentum component along the tube) and  $\ell$  (helical quantum number). Only two of these symmetries (quantum numbers) are needed to label the eigenstates, since the symmetries are not independent.<sup>72</sup> Conventionally translational symmetry is used to label the states, but this does not use the smallest possible unit cell and can therefore give many bands in the first Brillouin zone (FBZ) with the same angular momentum.

Any carbon nanotube can be generated from a primitive two atom unit cell using only discrete rotations and discrete screw operations and thereby giving (generalized) Bloch states  $|j, m, \ell\rangle$ .<sup>71,72</sup> The advantage of using this method is that each energy band (as a function of  $k$ ) has its own crystal angular momentum  $m$ . The discrete rotational symmetry is generated by the vector  $C_n$  along  $C$  giving the smallest possible rotation leaving the lattice invariant, i.e.

$$C_n = \frac{n}{n}a_1 + \frac{m}{n}a_2; \quad \text{where } n = \text{gcd}(n;m); \quad (\text{A.1})$$

i.e.  $n$  is the greatest common divisor of  $n$  and  $m$ . So a given  $(n;m)$  tube has crystal angular momentum  $m/2, 0, 1, \dots, n-1$ . The disadvantage of using the symmetry adapted Bloch states  $|j, m, \ell\rangle$  is that  $\ell$  is in the direction the generator  $H$  of the helical symmetry, which is general is different for different chiral vectors.

If we instead use the (often much) larger translational unit cell the states can be labelled by  $k \in [-\frac{\pi}{T}; \frac{\pi}{T}]$ , where  $T$  generates the translational symmetry (the translational vector) and is given by<sup>100</sup>

$$T = \frac{(2m+n)a_1 - (2n+m)a_2}{\text{gcd}(2m+n; 2n+m)}; \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Since we do not use the primitive unit cell in this case, but a larger translational unit cell, we get a smaller FBZ and thereby more bands in the FBZ than there are crystal angular momentum quantum numbers.

The conventional way to obtain the band structure for a isolated singlewall  $(n;m)$  nanotube using the translational unit cell is to apply periodic boundary conditions on the two dimensional graphene tight-binding state<sup>101</sup>  $\psi_k(r)$  along the circumferential  $C$  of the tube<sup>98,99</sup>, i.e.

$$\psi_k(r + C) = e^{ik \cdot C} \psi_k(r) = \psi_k(r) \quad k \cdot C = 2\pi g; \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where  $n_c$  is an integer in  $\{0; 1; 2; \dots; N-1\}$  with  $N = \frac{2(n^2 + m^2 + nm)}{\text{gcd}(2m+n; 2n+m)}$   $n$  being the number of (two atomic) graphene unit cells in a translational unit cell.<sup>100</sup> Thereby the  $n_c$  labels the bands (as a function of  $k$ ) using the translational unit cell. One disadvantage of using this




FIG. 10: (Left): The  $m = 1$  band for a (5;5) tube in the FBZ of the primitive unit cell as a function of  $2\pi/\gamma_0$ ;  $\gamma_0$ . (Center): The  $m = 1$  band is pushed into the smaller FBZ of the translational unit cell by using  $\gamma = \frac{k_a}{2} + \frac{n_c}{5}$  and that  $n_c = 1$  and  $n_c = 6$ , since  $m = 1$ . Note that the band is symmetrical around  $\frac{\pi}{5}$ , since  $m = 1$ . (Right): The band structure for the translational unit cell. Both bands have crystal angular momentum  $m = 1$ , but indices  $n_c = 1$  and  $n_c = 6$ .

larger translational unit cell is, that  $n_c$  is *not* the crystal angular momentum, but only related to the actual physical crystal angular momentum  $m$  by:

$$n_c = m \pmod{n}; \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Furthermore, we can connect the description of the band structure using the primitive unit cell and the translational unit cell by  $\gamma = k \cdot H$ , i.e. depends on both  $k$  and  $n_c$ .<sup>72</sup> An example is given in Fig. 10.

To do a tight-binding calculation for graphene<sup>101</sup> it is essential that the unit cell of graphene has two atoms, so the tight-binding state (Wannier decomposition of the eigenstate) has two components<sup>102</sup>:

$$\psi_k(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{R}} e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{R}} (\psi_k(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}) + \psi_k(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R} - \mathbf{d})); \quad (\text{A.5})$$

where  $\psi$  is a  $2p_z$  orbital (Wannier function) localized at each atom,  $\mathbf{R} = n_1 \mathbf{a}_1 + n_2 \mathbf{a}_2$  ( $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ ) are lattice vectors,  $N$  is the number of unit cells in the layer,  $\mathbf{d} = \frac{1}{3}(\mathbf{a}_1 + \mathbf{a}_2)$  is the vector between the two atoms in the unit cell and  $\psi_k, \psi_k$  are functions to be determined by the tight-binding calculation. To find the energy we insert  $\psi_k(\mathbf{r})$  in  $H \psi_k(\mathbf{r}) = E_k \psi_k(\mathbf{r})$  and obtain a  $2 \times 2$  matrix equation:

$$\begin{pmatrix} H_{11} & H_{12} \\ H_{21} & H_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \psi_k \\ \psi_k \end{pmatrix} = E_k \begin{pmatrix} S_{11} & S_{12} \\ S_{21} & S_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \psi_k \\ \psi_k \end{pmatrix}; \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where  $H_{ij}, S_{ij}$  are the overlap integrals with and without the Hamiltonian found in the nearest neighbor tight-binding approximation to be:

$$H_{12} = \epsilon_0 (1 + e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{a}} + e^{-i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{a}}) \psi_0(\mathbf{k}); \quad (\text{A.7})$$

$$S_{12} = S_0(\mathbf{k}); \quad S_{ii} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad H_{ii} = \epsilon_0; \quad (\text{A.8})$$

where the value of the overlap integral is  $\epsilon_0 \approx 3\text{eV}$ , the overlap of the orbitals are<sup>100</sup>  $S_0 \approx 0.1$  and  $\epsilon_0$  is the energy of the orbital, which is set to zero. Here the convention  $\epsilon_0; S_0 > 0$  is used. In the literature a range of different

Chirality	Type	$m_a$	$m_b$	$n$	$\mathbf{T} \cdot \mathbf{j}_a$	$D = a$
(n;n)	AL	0	0	$n$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3n}$
(7;4)	AL	0	0	1	$\frac{1}{31}$	$\frac{1}{93}$
(15;6)	AL	0	0	3	$\frac{1}{13}$	$\frac{1}{39}$
(8;23)	AL	0	0	1	$\frac{1}{259}$	$\frac{1}{777}$
(10;25)	AL	0	0	5	$\frac{1}{13}$	$\frac{1}{39}$
(n;0)	ZL	$\frac{2n}{3}$	$\frac{n}{3}$	$n$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{n}$
(9;6)	ZL	2	1	3	$\frac{1}{57}$	$\frac{1}{19}$
(6;21)	ZL	2	1	3	$\frac{1}{201}$	$\frac{1}{67}$
(18;12)	ZL	4	2	6	$\frac{1}{57}$	$\frac{1}{19}$
(12;24)	ZL	4	8	12	$\frac{1}{21}$	$\frac{1}{7}$

TABLE I: Examples of armchair-like (AL) and zigzag-like (ZL) metallic tubes, i.e. all kinds of metallic tubes. For the AL tubes the difference in the length of the translational vector  $\mathbf{T}$  and the diameter  $D$  is seen and for the ZL tubes we note the variety of the crystal angular momentum  $m_a = \frac{2n+m}{3} \pmod{n}$  and  $m_b = \frac{2m+n}{3} \pmod{n}$  of the bands crossing the Fermi level ( $E_F = 0$ ). Numerically, it turns out, that  $\mathbf{j}_a \cdot \mathbf{m}_b = 1$  for most of the ZL tubes, but there are other cases such as the (12;24) tube. Remember that  $n = \text{gcd}(n, m)$  and  $a = \frac{1}{3} \mathbf{j}_1 \cdot \mathbf{j}_2$

values is used (e.g.  $\mathbf{j}_0 \cdot \mathbf{j}_1 = 2, 5, 3, 1$ ).<sup>103,104,105,106</sup> By a diagonalization of Eq. (A.6) we find (for  $\mathbf{k} \in 0$ ):

$$E_k = \epsilon_0 \mathbf{j}(\mathbf{k}) \cdot \mathbf{j} \quad \frac{1}{k} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\mathbf{j}(\mathbf{k})}{\mathbf{j}(\mathbf{k}) \cdot \mathbf{j}}; \quad (\text{A.9})$$

where we have neglected  $S_0$  in the energy (but not in the eigenstate). By inserting  $\mathbf{k}$  decomposed along the tube ( $\mathbf{T}$ ) and around the tube ( $\mathbf{C}$ ):  $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{k}_T \frac{\mathbf{T}}{T} + \mathbf{k}_C \frac{\mathbf{C}}{C}$  with  $\mathbf{k}_C = \frac{2}{T} n_c$ , one obtains the band structure for nanotube labelled by  $\mathbf{k}$  and  $n_c$ . Essentially the same tight-binding calculation can be done using only the helical and rotational symmetry as in [71] and the same result is found, when we use  $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{H}$  and Eq. (A.4) to convert between the quantum numbers<sup>107</sup> (see Fig.10).

The Fermi level is at  $E_F = 0$ , since half of the states ( $2p_z$  orbitals) are filled. By doping and/or a gate voltage the Fermi level can be moved about  $0.4\text{eV}$ .<sup>6,76,77,90,91,92</sup> Furthermore note that graphene has electron-hole symmetry<sup>89</sup> for  $E_F = 0$  and therefore so does any  $(n; m)$  carbon nanotube.

### 1. The linearized band structure

We are only interested in the transport properties of nanotubes and therefore expand  $\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{k})$  around the Fermi level  $E_F = 0$ , i.e. around the two zeros<sup>108</sup> of  $\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{k})$ ,  $\mathbf{k}_\pm = \frac{2}{a} (\mp \frac{1}{3}; \pm \frac{1}{3})$ , ( $\mathbf{k} = 1$ ) and obtain

$$(\mathbf{k}_\pm + \mathbf{K}) \cdot \frac{1}{2} \frac{3a}{2} (i\mathbf{K}_x + \mathbf{K}_y); \quad (\text{A.10})$$

where we have introduced the deviation from  $K_\pm$  by  $K = k - K_\pm$ . Note that  $|K_\pm + K| \ll \frac{3a}{2} \frac{1}{\mathcal{F}j}$  used in Eq. (A.9). Furthermore, note that we do not expand around each individual  $\epsilon_F \neq 0$  used, but around  $\epsilon_F = 0$ , since this preserves the electron-hole symmetry of the band structure. By inserting  $K = K_T \frac{T}{\mathcal{F}j} + K_C \frac{C}{\mathcal{F}j}$  into the periodic boundary condition Eq. (A.3) the energy is found to be

$$\epsilon_{K_T, m_C} = \frac{2jv_0}{D} + \frac{K_T D}{2} + n_C \frac{(n+m) + \frac{1}{3}(m-n)}{2} \quad (A.11)$$

where  $D = \frac{p}{a} \frac{1}{n^2 + m^2 + mn}$  is the diameter,  $v_0 = \frac{p}{2} \frac{3aa}{2j}$  is the value of the velocity in all metallic tubes.

## 2. Unified picture of metallic tubes: armchair-like and zigzag-like tubes

We will now show using the linearized Eq. (A.10) that *all metallic tubes are either zigzag-like or armchair-like* and define the precise meaning of this. If  $\frac{n-m}{3} \in \mathbb{Z}$  the  $(n, m)$  tube is metallic and has four crossings of the Fermi level found from Eq. (A.11) to be: Two (the in Eq. (A.11)) for  $n_C^{\pm 1} = \frac{2m+n}{3}$  and two ( ) for  $n_C^{\pm 1} = \frac{2n+m}{3}$  (i.e.  $K_C = 0$ ). This gives the energy and eigenstates for the bands crossing the Fermi level:

$$\epsilon_{K_T, m_C} = \pm v_0 K_T \quad \text{and} \quad (A.12)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \frac{i(m-n) + \frac{1}{3}(n+m)}{2 \frac{1}{n^2 + m^2 + mn}} \quad ; \quad (A.13)$$

where  $\pm = 1$ . This is found by inserting the linearized

Eq. (A.10) into Eq. (A.9) and using  $K_C = 0$ . By doing this, we get  $\text{sign}(K_T)$  in  $\epsilon$  and  $\epsilon / \mathcal{F}j$  but we require continuity of the states (across the  $\epsilon = 0$  point where Eq. (A.9) was not valid) and remove the sign-function and thereby also the absolute value, i.e. the metallic linear bands cross the Fermi level ( $\epsilon_F = 0$ ). Note that  $\epsilon$  and  $\mathcal{F}j$  are independent of  $K_T$  and thereby  $k$  (to first order in  $k$ ), which turns out to be important in the Coulomb matrix element. The energy bands cross the Fermi level ( $\epsilon_F = 0$ ) at  $K_T = 0$  and since  $k = k - \frac{T}{\mathcal{F}j} = K_T + K_\pm \frac{T}{\mathcal{F}j}$  the crossing of  $\epsilon_F = 0$  as a function of  $k$  is at

$$K_\pm \frac{T}{\mathcal{F}j} = \begin{cases} \frac{2n}{\gcd(2n+m, 2m+n) \mathcal{F}j} & \text{for } \pm = +1 \\ \frac{2m}{\gcd(2n+m, 2m+n) \mathcal{F}j} & \text{for } \pm = -1 \end{cases} ; \quad (A.14)$$

which are either both at  $k = 0$  (double degenerate,  $n_C^{\pm 1}$ ) or  $k = \frac{2}{3\mathcal{F}j}$  (non-degenerate) for  $k$  in the FBZ,  $\frac{k}{\mathcal{F}j} = k - \frac{T}{\mathcal{F}j}$  (see [80] for details). Furthermore, we have the following connection between the crossing of  $\epsilon_F = 0$  and the crystal angular momentum of the

bands crossing<sup>109</sup>: If the bands are crossing  $\epsilon_F = 0$  at  $k = 0$ , then the two doubly degenerate crosses have different nonzero angular momentum  $m_a = \frac{2n+m}{3} \pmod{n}$ ,  $m_b = \frac{2m+n}{3} \pmod{n}$  and  $m_a \neq m_b$ . If on the other hand the crossing is at  $k = \frac{2}{3\mathcal{F}j}$ , then both crosses have  $m_a = m_b = 0$ . *This makes it possible to divide all metallic tubes into either armchair-like or zigzag-like tubes* (see figure 2) with the following bands crossing the Fermi level ( $\epsilon_F = 0$ ):

$$\text{Zigzag-like: } \epsilon_{km} = \pm v_0 k; \quad m \in m_a, m_b \pmod{n} \quad (A.15)$$

$$\text{Armchair-like: } \epsilon_k = \pm v_0 (k - k_0); \quad (m = 0); \quad (A.16)$$

where  $k_0 = \frac{2}{3\mathcal{F}j}$ ,  $\pm = 1$ ,  $\pm = 1$  and  $k \in [\frac{1}{\mathcal{F}j}, \frac{1}{\mathcal{F}j}]$ . The translational vector  $T$  (and  $\mathcal{F}j$ ) is different for different metallic tubes independent of the type. Note that the armchair-like bands are in general not connected in the way modelled by Eq. (A.16) (consider e.g. a (7;4) tube), but since they have the same angular momentum  $m = 0$  we connect the bands in this way for convenience. For scattering between the bands we will however consider the bands as four bands as we will see in section III. Examples of zigzag-like and armchair-like tubes are found in table I.

For a (real) armchair  $(n, n)$  tube the index in Eq. (A.16) is the parity in the angular coordinate in cylindrical coordinates<sup>73,74</sup> and the states are  $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2} \pm 1$  to all orders in  $k$  (in the nearest neighbor tight-binding approximation). Results similar to the ones obtained from the linearized Eq. (A.10) can be found by using the  $k - p$  approximation<sup>110</sup> however this does not reveal the crystal angular momentum.

## APPENDIX B: SCREENING IN THE RPA APPROACH INCLUDING THE BAND STRUCTURE

Here we calculate the screened Coulomb potential in the random phase approximation (RPA) in order to include both static and dynamical screening effects in the Coulomb drag, which have been seen to be important perviously for bilayer systems.<sup>55,56,81</sup>

The Dyson equation for the screened potential in real and frequency space is:

$$V(\mathbf{r}_1; \mathbf{r}_2; i) = V^0(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2) + \int d\mathbf{r} \int d\mathbf{r}' V^0(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r})^0(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{r}'; i) V(\mathbf{r}'; \mathbf{r}_2; i); \quad (B.1)$$

where the non-interacting polarizability is

$$^0(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{r}'; i) = -i \langle \hat{\rho}(\mathbf{r}; i) \hat{\rho}(\mathbf{r}'; i) \rangle_0; \quad (B.2)$$

where  $\hat{\rho}(\mathbf{r}; i)$  is the density operator in the interaction picture and the average  $\langle \dots \rangle_0$  is taken for non-interacting particles. By writing the density operator by the help of

a complete set of quantum states  $f'(\mathbf{r})g$  we find the polarizability to be

$$\chi^0(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{r}^0; ! ) = \sum_{\mathbf{r}^0} \frac{f^0(\mathbf{r}) - f^0(\mathbf{r}^0)}{! + i0^+} \sum_{\mathbf{r}^0} \chi^0(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{r}^0; ! ) \chi^0(\mathbf{r}^0; \mathbf{r}; ! ) \quad (\text{B.3})$$

where  $0^+$  is a positive infinitesimal,  $f^0(\mathbf{r})$  is the Fermi function and  $\chi^0(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{r}^0; ! )$  was introduced. To find the Coulomb matrix element we insert the RPA equation (B.1) into

$$\langle \mathbf{r}_1; \mathbf{r}_2; ! | \chi^0(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{r}^0; ! ) | \mathbf{r}_1; \mathbf{r}_2; ! \rangle = \int d\mathbf{r}_1 \int d\mathbf{r}_2 \chi^0(\mathbf{r}_1; \mathbf{r}_2; ! ) V(\mathbf{r}_1; \mathbf{r}_2; ! ) \chi^0(\mathbf{r}_1; \mathbf{r}_2; ! ) \quad (\text{B.4})$$

and get

$$\langle \mathbf{r}_1; \mathbf{r}_2; ! | \chi^0(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{r}^0; ! ) | \mathbf{r}_1; \mathbf{r}_2; ! \rangle = \langle \mathbf{r}_1; \mathbf{r}_2; ! | \chi^0(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{r}^0; ! ) | \mathbf{r}_1; \mathbf{r}_2; ! \rangle + \langle \mathbf{r}_1; \mathbf{r}_2; ! | \chi^0(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{r}^0; ! ) | \mathbf{r}_1; \mathbf{r}_2; ! \rangle \quad (\text{B.5})$$

where  $i_1, i_2$  are tube indices. Equivalently we introduce  $W_{i_1 i_2}^0$  for the sum over  $V^0$  (without the  $g$ 's and the  $\frac{1}{2L}$  factor). So Eq. (B.5) becomes

$$W_{i_1 i_2}(\mathbf{q}; \mathbf{m}_1; \mathbf{q}; \mathbf{m}_2; ! ) = \frac{1}{2L} \sum_{\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2} V^0(\mathbf{q}_1 + \mathbf{G}_{i_1}; \mathbf{m}_1 + n_{i_1} \mathbf{u}_{i_1}; \mathbf{q}_2 + \mathbf{G}_{i_2}; \mathbf{m}_2 + n_{i_2} \mathbf{u}_{i_2}; \mathbf{r}_{i_1}; \mathbf{r}_{i_2}); \quad (\text{B.6})$$

which has a matrix structure in the reciprocal lattice and in  $i$  and the effective polarization is

$$\chi_{\text{eff};i}^0(\mathbf{q}; \mathbf{m}; ! ) = \frac{2}{2L} \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}} \chi_i^0(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{q}; \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}; ! ) \chi_i^0(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{q}; \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}; ! ) \chi_i^0(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{q}; \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}; ! ) \quad (\text{B.8})$$

where  $\mathbf{q}^0$  is chosen such that  $\mathbf{m}^0 = \mathbf{m} + \mathbf{m}$ . Note that  $\chi_i^0$  is diagonal in the tube index  $i$ , since we do not include tunnelling between the tubes. In order to find the screened intershell Coulomb interaction we truncate Eq. (B.7) and only include the  $G_{i_1} = 0$  and  $u_{i_1} = 0$  term in the sum, which gives us a  $2 \times 2$  matrix equation (in  $i$ ) to find  $W_{12}$ , and therefore the screened Coulomb matrix element is:

$$\langle \mathbf{r}_1; \mathbf{r}_2; ! | \chi^0(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{r}^0; ! ) | \mathbf{r}_1; \mathbf{r}_2; ! \rangle = \frac{1}{2L} g_1(\mathbf{k}_1; \mathbf{q}_1; \mathbf{k}_1; \mathbf{q}_1) g_2(\mathbf{k}_2; \mathbf{q}_2; \mathbf{k}_2; \mathbf{q}_2) \quad (\text{B.9})$$

with

$$\chi_{\text{eff};i}^0(\mathbf{q}; \mathbf{m}; ! ) = \frac{1}{2L} \chi_{\text{eff};1}^0(\mathbf{q}; \mathbf{m}; ! ) V^0(\mathbf{q}; \mathbf{m}; \mathbf{r}_1; \mathbf{r}_1) + \frac{1}{2L} \chi_{\text{eff};2}^0(\mathbf{q}; \mathbf{m}; ! ) V^0(\mathbf{q}; \mathbf{m}; \mathbf{r}_2; \mathbf{r}_2) \quad (\text{B.10})$$

This equation can be used for any set of quantum states and in particular for the metallic states for nanotubes, so  $i$  is the set of indices  $(i; \mathbf{k}; \mathbf{q}; ! )$ , where  $i = 1, 2$  is the tube index,  $\mathbf{k}$  is the spin and remember that  $\mathbf{q}$  determines the angular momentum  $m$ . The screened and unscreened matrix elements Eq. (10) and Eq. (11) can now be inserted into Eq. (B.5) to get the screened matrix element. Doing this, we observe that  $g_1(\mathbf{k}_1; \mathbf{q}_1; \mathbf{k}_1; \mathbf{q}_1) g_2(\mathbf{k}_2; \mathbf{q}_2; \mathbf{k}_2; \mathbf{q}_2)$  is a common factor, which simplifies the result. To simplify further, we use that  $g_i$  and  $\chi_i^0$  are periodic in the reciprocal lattice  $G_i$  for subsystem  $i$ ,  $g(\mathbf{q}; \mathbf{q}^0) = g(\mathbf{q}; \mathbf{q}^0)$  and introduce  $\mathbf{q}_i = \mathbf{k}_i - \mathbf{k}_i, m_i = m_i$  and

where we have neglected the reciprocal lattice vectors different from zero and therefore used  $V^0(\mathbf{q}_{i1}; m_{i1}; \mathbf{r}_1; \mathbf{r}_2) W_{22}^0(\mathbf{q}_{i1}; m_{i1}; \mathbf{q}_{i2}; m_{i2}) V^0(\mathbf{q}_{i1}; m_{i1}; \mathbf{r}_2; \mathbf{r}_2) W_{12}^0(\mathbf{q}_{i1}; m_{i1}; \mathbf{q}_{i2}; m_{i2})' = 0$ .

If we consider armchair-like tubes (only the linear bands from Eq. (A.16)), then all the crystal angular momentum is zero and from the  $g$ -factor analysis in section III A the interband transition ( $\ell = 1$  &  $\ell = -1$  in Eq. (A.16)) can safely be neglected and for the intraband transition we have  $g = 1$ . Therefore

$$\epsilon_{\text{eff},i1}^0(\mathbf{q}; 0; ! ) = \frac{2}{L} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \sum_{\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}} \tilde{\chi}_i^0(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}; ! ) = \epsilon_{\text{eff},i1}^0(\mathbf{q}; ! ) = +1 + \epsilon_{\text{eff},i1}^0(\mathbf{q}; ! ) = -1; \quad (\text{B.11})$$

and for  $0 < q < \frac{1}{2\pi j}$  we find in the long tube limit and for zero temperature ( $T = 0$ )

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_{\text{eff},i1}^0(\mathbf{q}; ! ) = +1 &= \frac{2}{(2\pi)^2} \left\{ k_0 + \frac{\mu_F}{v_0} + q \frac{v_0 q k_0 + \frac{2\mu_F}{v_0}}{v_0^2 q^2} \right. \\ &+ q \left( k_0 + \frac{\mu_F}{v_0} \right) \frac{2v_0 q q \frac{1}{2\pi j} + \frac{1}{2v_0} \ln \frac{B}{A}}{v_0^2 q^2} + \frac{1}{2v_0} \ln \frac{B}{A} \frac{v_0^2 q k_0 + \frac{2\mu_F}{v_0}}{v_0^2 q^2} \frac{1}{A} \\ &+ q \left( \frac{1}{2} k_0 + \frac{\mu_F}{v_0} \right) \frac{1}{2v_0} \ln \frac{B}{A} \frac{v_0^2 q k_0 + \frac{2\mu_F}{v_0}}{v_0^2 q^2} \frac{1}{A} + \frac{1}{2} k_0 + \frac{\mu_F}{v_0} + q \frac{2v_0 q \frac{1}{2} k_0 + \frac{\mu_F}{v_0}}{v_0^2 q^2} \frac{1}{A} \Big\} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.12})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_{\text{eff},i1}^0(\mathbf{q}; ! ) = -1 &= \frac{2}{(2\pi)^2} \left\{ k_0 + \frac{\mu_F}{v_0} + q \frac{2v_0 q k_0 + \frac{\mu_F}{v_0}}{v_0^2 q^2} \frac{1}{A} \right. \\ &+ q \left( k_0 + \frac{\mu_F}{v_0} \right) \frac{1}{2v_0} \ln \frac{B}{A} \frac{v_0^2 q k_0 + \frac{2\mu_F}{v_0}}{v_0^2 q^2} \frac{1}{A} + \frac{1}{2} k_0 + \frac{\mu_F}{v_0} + q \frac{2v_0 q k_0 + \frac{\mu_F}{v_0}}{v_0^2 q^2} \frac{1}{A} \\ &+ q \left( \frac{1}{2} k_0 + \frac{\mu_F}{v_0} \right) \frac{1}{2v_0} \ln \frac{B}{A} \frac{v_0^2 q k_0 + \frac{2\mu_F}{v_0}}{v_0^2 q^2} \frac{1}{A} \Big\}; \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.13})$$

which for small  $q$  and  $!$  simplifies to the result in<sup>111</sup>:

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_{\text{eff},i1}^0(\mathbf{q}; ! ) = +1 &= \epsilon_{\text{eff},i1}^0(\mathbf{q}; ! ) = -1 \\ &= \frac{4v_0 q^2}{(2\pi)^2 (v_0 q^2)}; \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.14})$$

Note that in the static limit the effective polarizability is just a constant. The zero temperature approximation<sup>55</sup> of the polarizability is good as long as  $T$  is much smaller than  $T_F$ , which is often the case for nanotubes ( $T_F \sim 1000\text{K}$ ). Including finite temperature in the polarizability could give a plasmon enhanced drag as previously found for bilayer systems<sup>56,57</sup> at  $T \sim 0.5T_F$ .

For zigzag-like tubes the effective polarizability can be found in the same way, but for the linear bands crossing the Fermi level ( $\mu_F = 0$ ) we can – in contrast to the armchair-like case – have both  $m = 0$  and  $m = (m_a - m_b)$ .

The unscreened Coulomb interaction  $V^0(\mathbf{q}; m; \mathbf{r}_i; \mathbf{r}_j)$  can be found from the Poisson equation by Fourier transforming in the cylindrical coordinate and in the coordinate along the tube, i.e.<sup>80</sup>

$$V^0(\mathbf{q}; m; \mathbf{r}_i; \mathbf{r}_j) = \frac{e^2}{\epsilon_0} I_m(qr_i) K_m(qr_j) \frac{1}{r_i - r_j}; \quad (\text{B.15})$$

where  $I_m(x)$  ( $K_m(x)$ ) is the modified Bessel's functions of the first (second) kind of order  $m$  and  $\epsilon_0$  is the vacuum permittivity. Note that the small  $q$  limit is (logarithmic) divergent only for the potential with  $m = 0$ .

So we have all the ingredients in the screened Coulomb matrix element between different shells using the tight-binding states of the carbon nanotubes, which is used to model the Coulomb drag between the shells.

E-mail: lunan@fys.ku.dk

<sup>1</sup> S. Reich, C. Thomsen, and J. Maultzsch, *Carbon nanotubes* (Wiley-vch, 2003), 1st ed., ISBN 3-527-40386-8,

for a nice and resent review.

- <sup>2</sup> A. Bachtold, M. S. Fuhrer, S. Plyasunov, M. Forero, E. H. Anderson, A. Zettl, and P. L. McEuen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 6082 (2000).
- <sup>3</sup> W. Liang, M. Bockrath, D. Bozovic, J. H. Hafner, M. Tinkham, and H. Park, *Nature* **441**, 665 (2001).
- <sup>4</sup> A. Bachtold, M. S. Fuhrer, S. Plyasunov, M. Forero, E. H. Anderson, A. Zettl, and P. L. McEuen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 6082 (2000).
- <sup>5</sup> A. Bachtold, C. Strunk, J.-P. Salvetat, J.-M. Bonard, L. Forró, T. Nussbaumer, and C. Schonenberger, *Nature* **397**, 673 (1999).
- <sup>6</sup> C. Schonenberger, M. Buitelaar, M. Kruger, I. Widmer, T. Nussbaumer, and M. Iqbal, *Proceedings Moriond 2001, cond-mat/0106501* (2001).
- <sup>7</sup> R. Martel, T. Schmidt, H. R. Shea, T. Hertel, and P. Avouris, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **73**, 2447 (1998).
- <sup>8</sup> S. Frank, P. Poncharal, Z. Wang, and W. A. de Heer, *Science* **280**, 1744 (1998).
- <sup>9</sup> M. Bockrath, D. H. Cobden, P. L. McEuen, N. G. Chopra, A. Zettl, A. Thess, and R. E. Smalley, *Science* **275**, 1922 (1997).
- <sup>10</sup> S. J. Tans, M. H. Devoret, H. Dai, A. Thess, R. E. Smalley, L. J. Geerligs, and C. Dekker, *Nature* **386**, 474 (1997).
- <sup>11</sup> D. H. Cobden and J. Nygård, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 046803 (2002).
- <sup>12</sup> J. Nygård, D. H. Cobden, and P. E. Lindelof, *Nature* **408**, 342 (2000).
- <sup>13</sup> P. Jarillo-Herrero, S. Sapmaz, C. Dekker, L. P. Kouwenhoven, and H. S. J. van der Zant, *Nature* **429**, 389 (2004).
- <sup>14</sup> J. Nygård, D. H. Cobden, M. Bockrath, P. L. McEuen, and P. E. Lindelof, *Appl. Phys. A* **69**, 297 (1999).
- <sup>15</sup> P. L. McEuen, M. Bockrath, D. H. Cobden, Y.-G. Yoon, and S. G. Louie, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 5098 (1999).
- <sup>16</sup> J. Kong, E. Yenilmez, T. W. Tombler, W. Kim, H. Dai, R. B. Laughlin, L. Liu, C. S. Jayanthi, and S. Y. Wu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 106801 (2001).
- <sup>17</sup> A. Javey, J. Guo, Q. Wang, M. Lundstrom, and H. Dai, *Nature* **424**, 654 (2003).
- <sup>18</sup> D. Mann, A. Javey, J. Kong, Q. Wang, and H. Dai, *Nano Lett.* **3**, 1541 (2003).
- <sup>19</sup> R. Egger and A. O. Gogolin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 5082 (1997).
- <sup>20</sup> R. Egger and A. O. Gogolin, *Eur. Phys. J. B* **3**, 281 (1998).
- <sup>21</sup> M. Bockrath, D. H. Cobden, J. Lu, A. G. Rinzler, R. E. Smalley, L. Balents, and P. L. McEuen, *Nature* **397**, 598 (1999).
- <sup>22</sup> H. Ishii, H. Kataura, H. Shiozawa, H. Yoshioka, H. Otsubo, Y. Takayama, T. Miyahara, S. Suzuki, Y. Achiba, M. Nakatake, et al., *Nature* **426**, 540 (2003).
- <sup>23</sup> A. Kasumov, M. Kociak, M. Ferrier, R. Deblock, S. Guéron, B. Reulet, I. Khodos, O. Stéphan, and H. Bouchiat, *Phys. Rev. B* **68**, 214521 (2003).
- <sup>24</sup> R. Tarkiainen, M. Ahlskog, J. Penttilä, L. Roschier, P. Hakonen, M. Paalanen, and E. Sonin, *Phys. Rev. B* **64**, 195412 (2001), and ref. therein.
- <sup>25</sup> V. Krstić, S. Blumentritt, J. Muster, S. Roth, and A. Rubio, *Phys. Rev. B* **67**, 041401(R) (2003).
- <sup>26</sup> N. Kang, L. Lu, W. J. Kong, J. S. Hu, W. Yi, Y. P. Wang, D. L. Zhang, Z. W. Pan, and S. S. Xie, *Phys. Rev. B* **67**, 033404 (2003).
- <sup>27</sup> R. Egger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 5547 (1999).
- <sup>28</sup> T. Hunger, B. Lengeler, and J. Appenzeller, *Phys. Rev. B* **69**, 195406 (2004).
- <sup>29</sup> Y.-G. Yoon, P. Delaney, and S. G. Louie, *Phys. Rev. B* **66**, 073407 (2002).
- <sup>30</sup> A. A. Maarouf, C. L. Kane, and E. J. Mele, *Phys. Rev. B* **61**, 11156 (2000), and ref. therein.
- <sup>31</sup> P. G. Collins, M. S. Arnold, and P. Avouris, *Science* **292**, 706 (2001).
- <sup>32</sup> J. Cumings, P. G. Collins, and A. Zettl, *Nature* **406**, 586 (2000).
- <sup>33</sup> S. Dohn, Master's thesis, MIC-Department of Micro and Nanotechnology (2003).
- <sup>34</sup> P. G. Collins and P. Avouris, *Appl. Phys. A-Mater.* **74**, 329 (2002).
- <sup>35</sup> Q. H. Li and T. Wang, *Sci. China Ser. E.* **47**, 1 (2004).
- <sup>36</sup> J. Cumings and A. Zettl, *Science* **289**, 602 (2000).
- <sup>37</sup> S. Roche, F. Triozon, A. Rubio, and D. Mayou, *Phys. Rev. B* **64**, 121401 (2001).
- <sup>38</sup> S. Roche, F. Triozon, A. Rubio, and D. Mayou, *Phys. Lett. A* **285**, 94 (2001).
- <sup>39</sup> F. Triozon, S. Roche, A. Rubio, and D. Mayou, *Phys. Rev. B* **69**, 121410(R) (2004).
- <sup>40</sup> K.-H. Ahn, Y.-H. Kim, J. Wiersig, and K. J. Chang, *Physica E* **22**, 666 (2004).
- <sup>41</sup> A. Hansson and S. Stafstrom, *Phys. Rev. B* **67**, 075406 (2003).
- <sup>42</sup> S. Sanvito, Y.-K. Kwon, D. Tománek, and C. J. Lambert, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 1974 (2000).
- <sup>43</sup> Y. Miyamoto, S. Saito, and D. Tománek, *Phys. Rev. B* **65**, 041402(R) (2002).
- <sup>44</sup> S. Uryu, *Phys. Rev. B* **69**, 075402 (2004).
- <sup>45</sup> D.-H. Kim and K. J. Chang, *Phys. Rev. B* **66**, 155402 (2002).
- <sup>46</sup> B. Bourlon, C. Miko, L. Forro, D. Glatli, and A. Bachtold (2004), *condmat/0407672*.
- <sup>47</sup> M. B. Pogrebinskii, *Fiz. Tekh. Poluprovodn.* **11** 637 (1977) [*Sov. Phys. Semicond.* **11** 372 (1977)] (1977).
- <sup>48</sup> P. J. Price, *Physica B and C* **117**, 750 (1983).
- <sup>49</sup> Other  $e-e$  interactions such as phonon mediated interaction could give an important contribution as seen in bilayer systems.<sup>58</sup> This could be included in future studies.
- <sup>50</sup> Q. Zheng and Q. Jiang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 045503 (2002), and citations of this paper.
- <sup>51</sup> J. Nygård, P. Bøggild and P. Hakonen, private comm.
- <sup>52</sup> T. Sugai, H. Yoshida, T. Shimada, T. Okazaki, H. Shinohara, and S. Bandow, *Nano Lett.* **3**, 769 (2003).
- <sup>53</sup> A. G. Rojo, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **11**, R31 (1999), for a good review.
- <sup>54</sup> T. J. Gramila, J. P. Eisenstein, A. H. MacDonald, L. N. Pfeiffer, and K. W. West, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **66**, 1216 (1991).
- <sup>55</sup> A.-P. Jauho and H. Smith, *Phys. Rev. B* **47**, 4420 (1993).
- <sup>56</sup> K. Flensberg and B. Y.-K. Hu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **73**, 3572 (1994).
- <sup>57</sup> N. P. R. Hill, J. T. Nicholls, E. H. Linfield, M. Pepper, D. A. Ritchie, G. A. C. Jones, B. Y.-K. Hu, and K. Flensberg, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 2204 (1997).
- <sup>58</sup> M. C. Bønsager, K. Flensberg, B. Y.-K. Hu, and A. H. MacDonald, *Phys. Rev. B* **57**, 7085 (1998).
- <sup>59</sup> I. Gornyi, A. Mirlin, and F. von Oppen, *condmat/0406176* (2004).
- <sup>60</sup> A. Komnik and R. Egger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 2881 (1998).
- <sup>61</sup> K. Flensberg, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 184 (1998).
- <sup>62</sup> Y. V. Nazarov and D. V. Averin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 653 (1998).



- <sup>63</sup> V. V. Ponomarenko and D. V. Averin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 4928 (2000).
- <sup>64</sup> S. A. Klesse R, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 16912 (2000).
- <sup>65</sup> A. Komnik and R. Egger, Eur. Phys. J. B **19**, 271 (2000).
- <sup>66</sup> B. Trauzettel, R. Egger, and H. Grabert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 116401 (2002).
- <sup>67</sup> B. Gao, A. Komnik, R. Egger, D. C. Glatli, and A. Bachtold, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 216804 (2004).
- <sup>68</sup> T. Ando and T. Nakanishi, J. Phys. soc. Jpn. **67**, 1704 (1998).
- <sup>69</sup> T. Ando, T. Nakanishi, and R. Saito, J. Phys. soc. Jpn. **67**, 2857 (1998).
- <sup>70</sup> R. Klesse, Phys. Rev. B **66**, 085409 (2002).
- <sup>71</sup> C. T. White, D. H. Robertson, and J. W. Mintmire, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 5485 (1993).
- <sup>72</sup> J. W. Mintmire and C. T. White, Carbon **33**, 893 (1995).
- <sup>73</sup> T. Vukovic, I. Milosevic, and M. Damnjanovic, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 045418 (2002).
- <sup>74</sup> M. Damnjanovic, I. Milosevic, T. Vukovic, and R. Sredanovic, Phys. Rev. B **60**, 2728 (1999).
- <sup>75</sup> We do not have exchange interaction between the tubes, since the inter tube tunnelling were neglected. Therefore we can use product states instead of anti-symmetrized wave functions.
- <sup>76</sup> R. S. Lee, H. J. Kim, J. E. Fischer, J. Lefebvre, M. Radosavljevic, J. Hone, and A. T. Johnson, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 4526 (2000).
- <sup>77</sup> C. Zhou, J. Kong, E. Yenilmez, and H. Dai, Science **290**, 1552 (2000).
- <sup>78</sup> Note that in doing the wrapping of the graphene band structure we are going from a two to three dimensional description and thereby the radial part of the wave function is  $j_j / \frac{(r - r^c)}{r}$ , where  $r^c$  is the radius of the tube.
- <sup>79</sup> The matrix elements (10) and (11) could also have been obtained using the helical symmetry states  $j m i$ , which has the advantage of making the g-factor an explicitly periodic function of reciprocal lattice vectors whereas using the translational unit cell this periodicity has to be imposed by hand.<sup>80</sup> The states are given explicitly in Ref. [71,72].
- <sup>80</sup> A. M. Lunde, Master's thesis, Niels Bohr Institute and MIC-Department of Micro and Nanotechnology, see [www.fys.ku.dk/flensberg/students.htm](http://www.fys.ku.dk/flensberg/students.htm) (2004).
- <sup>81</sup> K. Flensberg and B. Y.-K. Hu, Phys. Rev. B **52**, 14796 (1995).
- <sup>82</sup> A. Alkauskas, K. Flensberg, B. Y.-K. Hu, and A.-P. Jauho, Phys. Rev. B **66**, 201304(R) (2002).
- <sup>83</sup> B. Y.-K. Hu, Phys. Rev. B **57**, 12345 (1998).
- <sup>84</sup> K. Flensberg, B. Y.-K. Hu, A.-P. Jauho, and J. M. Kinaret, Phys. Rev. B **52**, 14761 (1995).
- <sup>85</sup> H. Smith and H. H. Jensen, *Transport Phenomena* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1989).
- <sup>86</sup> M. Pustilnik, E. G. Mishchenko, L. I. Glazman, and A. V. Andreev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 126805 (2003).
- <sup>87</sup> N. A. Mortensen, K. Flensberg, and A.-P. Jauho, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 1841 (2001).
- <sup>88</sup> V. L. Gurevich, V. B. Pevzner, and E. W. Fenton, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **10**, 2551 (1998).
- <sup>89</sup> The definition of electron-hole symmetry can be given as follows: For each occupied  $k$  state (at  $T = 0$ ) with energy  $\epsilon_k$  and velocity  $v_k$  there exists one and only one empty state  $k^0$  with the same velocity  $v_{k^0} = v_k$  and the opposite energy with respect to the Fermi level:  $\epsilon_F - \epsilon_k = (\epsilon_F - \epsilon_{k^0})$ . In this way there is a one to one correspondence between the electrons (i.e. the filled states) and holes (i.e. the empty states).
- <sup>90</sup> M. Kruger, M. R. Buitelaar, T. Nussbaumer, C. Schonenberger, and L. Forro, Appl. Phys. Lett. **78**, 1291 (2001).
- <sup>91</sup> C. Zhou, J. Kong, and H. Dai, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 5604 (2000).
- <sup>92</sup> A. Javey, H. Kim, M. Brink, Q. Wang, A. Ural, J. Guo, P. McIntyre, P. Mceuen, M. Lundstrom, and H. Dai, Nature Materials **1**, 241 (2002).
- <sup>93</sup> A. M. Lunde and A.-P. Jauho, Semicond. Sci. Technol. **19**, S433 (2004).
- <sup>94</sup> B. Y.-K. Hu and K. Flensberg, Hot Carriers in Semiconductors (HCIS-9), eds. K. Hess et al., 421, Plenum Press (1996).
- <sup>95</sup>  $\text{In}^{20}_{\text{r}} = 1.4$  is used.
- <sup>96</sup> Note that the crystal angular momentum conservation depend on whether the tubes are commensurable or not.<sup>80</sup>
- <sup>97</sup> G. Qin, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **7**, 9785 (1995).
- <sup>98</sup> N. Hamada, S.-I. Sawada, and A. Oshiyama, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 1579 (1992).
- <sup>99</sup> R. Saito, M. Fujita, G. Dresselhaus, and M. S. Dresselhaus, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 1804 (1992).
- <sup>100</sup> R. Saito, G. Dresselhaus, and M. S. Dresselhaus, *Physical Properties of Carbon Nanotubes* (Imperial College press, 1998), 3rd ed.
- <sup>101</sup> P. R. Wallace, Phys. Rev. **71**, 622 (1947).
- <sup>102</sup> N. Ashcroft and N. Mermin, *Solid State Physics* (Harcourt College Publishers, 1976), college ed.
- <sup>103</sup> S. D. M. Brown, P. Corio, A. Marucci, M. A. Pimenta, M. S. Dresselhaus, and G. Dresselhaus, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 7734 (2000).
- <sup>104</sup> S. Reich, J. Maultzsch, C. Thomsen, and P. Ordejón, Phys. Rev. B **66**, 035412 (2002).
- <sup>105</sup> J. W. G. Wilder, L. C. Venema, A. G. Rinzler, R. E. Smalley, and C. Dekker, Nature **391**, 59 (1998).
- <sup>106</sup> T. W. Odom, J.-L. Huang, P. Kim, and C. M. Lieber, Nature **391**, 62 (1998).
- <sup>107</sup> To get a feeling for the connection between the description of the band structure using the translational and primitive unit cell one can use the *Mathematica* program: Atomic and Electronic Structure of Carbon nanotubes, by M. Brandbyge, found at <http://library.wolfram.com/infocenter/MathSource/384/>.
- <sup>108</sup> Note that graphene has six zeros all at the FBZ boundary and these are given in three pairs connected by reciprocal lattice vectors of graphene.
- <sup>109</sup> We only have numerical proof for this property, found by trying all combinations of  $n; m \leq 100$ .
- <sup>110</sup> H. Ajiki and T. Ando, J. Phys. soc. Jpn. **62**, 1255 (1993).
- <sup>111</sup> W. Que, Phys. Rev. B **66**, 193405 (2002).