

# On electron (anti)localization in graphene

D. V. Khveshchenko

*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC 27599*

We discuss localization properties of the Dirac-like electronic states in monolayers of graphite. In the framework of a general disorder model, we identify the conditions under which such standard localization effects as, e.g., the logarithmic temperature-dependent conductivity correction appear to be strongly suppressed, as compared to the case of a two-dimensional electron gas with parabolic dispersion, in agreement with recent experimental observations.

After several decades of predominantly application-driven studies, graphene has finally been recognized as a unique example of the system of two-dimensional fermions with a linear dispersion and pseudo-relativistic kinematical properties. The recent advances in microfabrication of graphitic samples that are only a few carbon layers thick<sup>1,2</sup> have made it possible to test the early theoretical predictions of the anomalous properties of this system<sup>3</sup>.

The most striking experimental observation up to date was that of an anomalous quantization of the Hall conductivity<sup>1,2,4</sup> which is characteristic of the pseudo-relativistic nature of the quasiparticle excitations in this system. The other properties manifesting this peculiar single-particle kinematics have been revealed by magnetotransport measurements, including the  $\sqrt{B}$  dependence of the energies of the (non-equidistant) Landau levels and the intrinsic  $\pi$ -shift of the phase of the Shubnikov-de Haas oscillations<sup>1,2,5</sup>.

In a (nearly) degenerate semimetal such as graphite, the Coulomb interactions are expected to play an important role, largely due to their poor screening<sup>6</sup>. Besides, any interplay between the Coulomb interactions and disorder is likely to further modify the behavior of the idealized (clean and non-interacting) Dirac fermion system. Thus far, however, experiment has not yet provided a direct evidence of any interaction-induced phenomena, some of which were predicted in the recent years<sup>6,7</sup>.

Also, contrary to the situation in the conventional 2DEG, the data of Refs.<sup>1,2</sup> do not seem to manifest any pronounced weak-localization effects, either. Motivated by these observations, in the present work we set out to study electron localization in graphene. Although this topic has already attracted some recent attention<sup>8</sup>, we shall demonstrate that the analysis of Ref.<sup>8</sup> is neither complete, nor (curiously enough, considering that the assertions made in Ref.<sup>8</sup> are mostly correct) do the arguments presented in that work appear to be technically sound.

The electronic band structure of graphene is characterized by the presence of a pair of inequivalent nodal points at the wave vectors  $\vec{K}_{1,2} = 2\pi/9a(\pm\sqrt{3}, 3)$  where  $a$  is the lattice spacing. At these two and the four other points in the Brillouin zone obtainable from  $\vec{K}_{1,2}$  with a shift by one of the reciprocal lattice vectors  $\vec{Q}_{1,2} = 2\pi/3a(\sqrt{3}, \pm 1)$ , the valence and conduction bands touch upon each other as a pair of opposing cones with the

opening angle given by the Fermi velocity  $v_F$ .

In the leading approximation, quasiparticle excitations in the vicinity of the nodal points (hereafter referred to as valleys) can be described by the Dirac Hamiltonian<sup>3</sup>

$$H = v_F[\hat{1} \otimes \hat{\sigma}_x k_x + \hat{\tau}_z \otimes \hat{\sigma}_y k_y] \quad (1)$$

where  $\hat{\sigma}_i$  is the triplet of the Pauli matrices acting in the space of spinors  $\Psi = (u_A, v_B)$  composed of the values of the electron wave function on the  $A$  and  $B$  sublattices of the hexagonal lattice of graphene, whereas the triplet  $\hat{\tau}_i$  acts in the valley subspace. In the absence of magnetic field, the Hamiltonian (1) remains a unity matrix in the physical spin subspace.

In the presence of disorder, the quasiparticles experience both intra- and inter-valley scattering. Upon averaging over disorder, the most general form of the elastic four-fermion vertex induced by disorder can be described by the expression

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{W} = & g_4 \left[ \frac{1+\tau_z}{2} \otimes \frac{1+\tau_z}{2} + \frac{1-\tau_z}{2} \otimes \frac{1-\tau_z}{2} \right] \\ & + g_2 \left[ \frac{1+\tau_z}{2} \otimes \frac{1-\tau_z}{2} + \frac{1-\tau_z}{2} \otimes \frac{1+\tau_z}{2} \right] \\ & + g_1 [\tau_+ \otimes \tau_- + \tau_- \otimes \tau_+] + g_3 [\tau_+ \otimes \tau_+ + \tau_- \otimes \tau_-] \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where we used the customary "g-ological" notations to denote the processes of forward scattering between fermions from the same ( $g_4$ ) and different ( $g_2$ ) valleys, as well as those of "backward" scattering ( $g_1$ ) with the momentum transfer close to  $\vec{K}_1 - \vec{K}_2$ . Besides, we have included the possibility of "umklapp" scattering ( $g_3$ ), in which case the total momentum of two fermions changes by  $2(\vec{K}_1 - \vec{K}_2) = \vec{K}_2 - \vec{K}_1 + \vec{Q}$ . A justification for this (not immediately obvious, considering that the total momentum changes by only a fraction of the reciprocal lattice vector) extension of the disorder model will be discussed below.

In the framework of the self-consistent Born approximation (SCBA), the effect of disorder on the quasiparticle spectrum is described by a self-energy which obeys the equation

$$\hat{\Sigma}^R(\omega, \vec{k}) = \int \frac{d\vec{q}}{(2\pi)^2} Tr \hat{W} \hat{G}^R(\omega, \vec{k} + \vec{q}) \quad (3)$$

where the retarded Green function is given by the expres-

sion

$$\hat{G}^R(\omega, \vec{k}) = \frac{(\omega - \mu + \Sigma^R)\hat{1} \otimes \hat{1} + v_F(\hat{1} \otimes \hat{\sigma}_x k_x + \hat{\tau}_z \otimes \hat{\sigma}_y k_y)}{(\omega - \mu + \Sigma^R)^2 - v_F^2 k^2} \quad (4)$$

that includes a chemical potential  $\mu$  which allows one to account for a variable electron density.

Notably, the solution to Eq.(3) turns out to be diagonal in the valley subspace,  $\hat{\Sigma}^R(0, 0) = i\gamma\hat{1} \otimes \hat{1}$ , and proportional to the inverse elastic lifetime

$$\gamma = \frac{\pi\nu_F}{2}(g_4 + g_1) \quad (5)$$

where  $\nu_F$  is the density of states at the Fermi energy. In the low-doping limit ( $\mu < \gamma$ ), a finite value of  $\nu_F = -\int d\vec{k}/(4\pi^3)ImG(\mu, \vec{k})$  is dominated by disorder. A similar phenomenon has been extensively studied in the context of normal quasiparticle transport in dirty  $d$ -wave superconductors where  $\mu = 0$  and the spectrum possesses an exact particle-hole symmetry<sup>9</sup>. In both cases one obtains the self-consistent DOS as  $\nu_F = (\gamma/2\pi)\ln(v_F/a\gamma)$ .

However, most of the data of Refs.<sup>1,2</sup> pertain to the regime of relatively high dopings ( $\mu \gg \gamma$ ), as indicated by, e.g., the measured mean free path, which was found to be of order  $\sim 1\mu m$  at electron densities  $n_e \sim 10^{13}cm^{-2}$ . In this regime, the value of  $\nu_F = k_F/(2\pi v_F)$  is controlled by the finite radius of the Fermi surface  $k_F = \mu/v_F = (4\pi n_e)^{1/2}$  and is only weakly affected by disorder.

Therefore, the double-pole Green function (4) given by a four-by-four matrix can be well approximated by a pair of two-by-two matrices containing single-poles

$$\hat{G}_{1,2}(\omega, \vec{k}) \approx \frac{1 + \hat{\sigma}_x \cos \phi_k \pm \hat{\sigma}_y \sin \phi_k}{2(\omega - \xi_k + i\gamma)} \quad (6)$$

where  $\xi_k = v_F k - \mu$  and  $\phi_k = \tan^{-1} k_y/k_x$ .

Even more importantly, the presence of a large parameter  $\mu/\gamma$  facilitates a systematic account of quantum interference corrections to the SCBA results. We mention, in passing, that in the low-doping ( $\mu < \gamma$ ) limit the only parameter that can (at least, in principle) be used for the analysis of such corrections is the (inverse) number of valleys, whose actual value is, of course,  $N_v = 2$ . The same caveat plagues the analysis of dirty  $d$ -wave superconductors where the strength of the conductivity corrections is governed by the number of pairs of opposite nodes of the order parameter, whose physical value is again equal two.

Luckily, in the high-density regime that, so far, has been probed in graphene, the leading quantum correction to the zeroth-order (Drude) conductivity stem from the standard single-Cooperon (fan-shaped) diagram. From the technical standpoint, however, the calculation of the corresponding correction appears to be somewhat more involved due to the matrix structure of the Green function (6) and the vertex (2).

The Drude conductivity itself is given by the standard expression  $\sigma_0 = (e^2/h)\Gamma\mu/\gamma$  where the renormalization factor  $\Gamma$  accounts for a ladder series of vertex

corrections associated with one of the two current operators  $\vec{J} = v_F(\cos \phi_k, \sin \phi_k)$  inserted into the fermion loop in the diagrammatic representation of the Kubo formula. Being given by a non-singular (angular momentum  $m = 1$ ) diffusion mode in the expansion over the angular harmonics  $e^{im\phi_k}$ ,  $\Gamma$  is a function of the parameters  $g_i$ .

Expanding the expression for the Cooperon in the same basis as that used in Eq.(2), we obtain equations for the corresponding amplitudes  $C_i$ , each of which is a matrix in the direct product of two  $\hat{\sigma}_i$  subspaces

$$\begin{aligned} C_1 &= g_1 + g_2 H_{12} C_1 + g_1 H_{21} C_2 \\ C_2 &= g_2 + g_2 H_{12} C_2 + g_1 H_{21} C_1 \\ C_3 &= g_3 + g_4 H_{11} C_3 + g_3 H_{22} C_4 \\ C_4 &= g_4 + g_4 H_{11} C_4 + g_3 H_{22} C_3 \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where  $H_{ij}(\omega, \vec{q}) = \int \frac{d\vec{k}}{(2\pi)^2} G_i^R(\epsilon + \omega/2, k + q/2) G_j^A(\omega/2 - \epsilon, q/2 - k)$  denotes a convolution of a pair of Green functions. Computing the latter at  $\omega, v_F q \ll \gamma$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}_{11,12}(\omega, q) &= \hat{H}_{22,21}(\omega, q) = \frac{\pi\nu_F}{4\gamma} \left[ \left(1 + \frac{i\omega}{2\gamma} - \frac{v_F^2 q^2}{16\gamma^2}\right) \hat{1} \otimes \hat{1} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{i\omega}{2\gamma} - \frac{v_F^2 q^2}{16\gamma^2}\right) \frac{3 \cos^2 \phi_k + \sin^2 \phi_k}{4} \hat{\sigma}_x \otimes \hat{\sigma}_x \right. \\ &\quad \left. \mp \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{i\omega}{2\gamma} - \frac{v_F^2 q^2}{16\gamma^2}\right) \frac{\cos^2 \phi_k + 3 \sin^2 \phi_k}{4} \hat{\sigma}_y \otimes \hat{\sigma}_y \right] \quad (8) \end{aligned}$$

It can be readily seen that Eqs.(7) split onto two pairs which only couple  $C_{1,2}$  and  $C_{3,4}$ , respectively. Their solutions read

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{C}_{1,2}(\omega, q) &= \frac{2\gamma c_{1,2}}{\pi\nu_F} \frac{\hat{1} \otimes \hat{1} - \hat{\sigma}_x \otimes \hat{\sigma}_x + \hat{\sigma}_y \otimes \hat{\sigma}_y + \hat{\sigma}_z \otimes \hat{\sigma}_z}{(g_4 - g_2)/(g_2 + g_1) + v_F^2 q^2/16\gamma^2 - i\omega/2\gamma} \\ \hat{C}_{3,4}(\omega, q) &= \frac{2\gamma c_{3,4}}{\pi\nu_F} \frac{\hat{1} \otimes \hat{1} - \hat{\sigma}_x \otimes \hat{\sigma}_x - \hat{\sigma}_y \otimes \hat{\sigma}_y - \hat{\sigma}_z \otimes \hat{\sigma}_z}{(g_1 - g_3)/(g_3 + g_4) + v_F^2 q^2/16\gamma^2 - i\omega/2\gamma} \quad (9) \end{aligned}$$

where  $c_1 = (g_1^2 + g_1 g_4)/(g_4 - g_2 + 2g_1)(g_1 + g_2)$ ,  $c_2 = (g_2 g_4 + g_1 g_2 - g_2^2 + g_1^2)/(g_4 - g_2 + 2g_1)(g_1 + g_2)$ ,  $c_3 = (g_3 g_1 + g_3 g_4)/(g_1 + g_3)(g_3 + g_4)$ , and  $c_4 = (g_1 g_4 + g_3^2)/(g_1 + g_3)(g_3 + g_4)$ .

The quantum conductivity correction (including spin)

$$\delta\sigma_{xx} = -\frac{e^2}{h} \frac{\pi\nu_F v_F^2}{16\gamma^3} \int \frac{d\vec{q}}{(2\pi)^2} Tr[\hat{C}_1(0, q) + \hat{C}_4(0, q)] \quad (10)$$

involves the  $C_1$  and  $C_4$  components of the Cooperon, whose contributions turn out to be negative and positive, respectively. The logarithmic temperature-dependent part of Eq.(10) can be cast in the form

$$\delta\sigma_{xx} = \frac{2e^2}{\pi h} \ln \frac{\max[\Gamma_\phi/\gamma, |g_4 - g_2|/(g_1 + g_2)]^{c_1}}{\max[\Gamma_\phi/\gamma, |g_1 - g_3|/(g_3 + g_4)]^{c_4}} \quad (11)$$

where we introduced an inelastic phase relaxation rate  $\Gamma_\phi(T)$  which provides a cutoff in the momentum integration and diverges at  $T \rightarrow 0$ .

The analysis of Eq.(11) reveals that, in the absence of a fine tuning between the amplitudes of backward scattering and umklapp processes ( $g_1 \neq g_3$ ) the  $C_4$  Cooperon always acquires a gap  $\sim \gamma|g_1 - g_3|/(g_4 + g_3)$ . On the other hand, the  $C_1$  mode remains gapless, provided that all the forward scattering processes are controlled by the same amplitude (i.e.,  $g_2 = g_4$ ).

Conversely, making the  $C_1$  mode gapful and inverting the sign of the conductivity correction would only be possible under the condition  $|g_1 - g_3| < |g_2 - g_4|$  which is unlikely to be satisfied for any realistic impurity potential that yields equal amplitudes of the processes of intra- and inter-valley forward scattering.

The antilocalizing behavior predicted in Ref.<sup>8</sup> for  $g_1 < g_2 = g_4$  and  $g_3 = 0$  ( $c_1 = 1/2$ ,  $c_4 = 1$ ) can only occur at intermediate temperatures (namely, at  $\gamma g_1/g_2 < \Gamma_\phi(T) < \gamma$ ), whereas at still lower temperatures the overall sign of (11) reverts to negative, thereby suggesting the onset of rather conventional weak localization.

The above conclusions apply to the general disorder model (2). However, in the situation where disorder is realized as a random distribution of impurities with a concentration  $n_i$  and a (short-range) potential  $u(q)$ , it suffices to introduce only two independent parameters

$$\begin{aligned} g_2 = g_4 &= \frac{n_i u^2(0)}{1 + (\pi \nu_F u(0))^2} \\ g_1 = g_3 &= \frac{n_i u^2(\vec{K}_1 - \vec{K}_2)}{1 + (\pi \nu_F u(\vec{K}_1 - \vec{K}_2))^2} \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

The above expressions represent a  $\hat{T}$ -matrix computed for an arbitrary strength of disorder, the customary Born and unitarity (where the scattering phase approaches  $\pi/2$ ) limits corresponding to  $u \rightarrow 0$  and  $\infty$ , respectively. [In the case of a genuine long-range (unscreened) impurity potential, the dependence  $u(q)$  on the transferred momentum makes the explicit formulas for  $g_i$  more involved, though.]

Provided that the relations (12) between the parameters  $g_i$  hold, one obtains  $c_1 = c_4 = 1/2$ , and the logarithmic term in (11) vanishes as a result of the exact cancellation between the contributions of the localizing ( $C_1$ ) and antilocalizing ( $C_4$ ) Cooperon modes. It has to be stressed, however, that such a strong suppression of (anti)localization would only be possible due to an opening of the umklapp channel. In turn, the latter requires an emergence of a crystal superstructure with the wave vector  $2(\vec{K}_1 - \vec{K}_2) = (2/3)(\vec{Q}_1 + \vec{Q}_2)$  (or equivalent).

While an isolated sheet of weakly-interacting graphene would apparently lack such a superstructure, it is conceivable that the latter might emerge if a commensurate substrate were used during the process of microfabrication. Besides, a commensurate corrugation could occur<sup>10</sup> due to the Coulomb correlations that can induce spatially periodic patterns of the electron density itself. The possibility of a spontaneous formation of such charge density

wave states has long been discussed in the general context of degenerate semimetals and, specifically, in graphene<sup>11</sup>.

Next, we comment on the technical details presented in Ref.<sup>8</sup> where the first prediction of the antilocalization behavior for  $g_2 = g_4$  and  $g_1 = g_3 = 0$  was made. In essence, instead of working directly with the matrices in the sublattice subspace, the authors of Ref.<sup>8</sup> used single-component (projected) Green functions  $G(\omega, \vec{k}) = 1/(\omega - \xi_k + i\gamma)$  complemented by matrix elements of a (purely forward-scattering) impurity potential between different Bloch wave functions.

To that end, in Ref.<sup>8</sup> the latter were chosen in a particular (asymmetrical) gauge

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{1k} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\pm 1, e^{i\phi_k}, 0, 0), \\ \psi_{2k} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (0, 0, e^{i\phi_k}, \pm 1) \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

The aforementioned matrix element of the impurity potential is then given by a complex-valued expression  $\langle \vec{p}|u|\vec{k} \rangle \propto (1 + e^{i(\phi_k - \phi_p)})$ .

Next, the authors of Ref.<sup>8</sup> asserted that the equations for the Cooperon mode involve the disorder-induced vertex

$$\begin{aligned} W_{k,-k,p,-p} &= n_i \langle \vec{p}|u|\vec{k} \rangle \langle -\vec{p}|u|-\vec{k} \rangle \\ &\propto e^{i(\phi_k - \phi_p)} [1 + \cos(\phi_k - \phi_p)] \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

which describes scattering from the Bloch states with momenta  $\vec{k} + \vec{q}/2$  and  $-\vec{k} + \vec{q}/2$  into  $\vec{p} + \vec{q}/2$  and  $-\vec{p} + \vec{q}/2$  in the limit  $q \rightarrow 0$ .

It was then argued in Ref.<sup>8</sup> that the full Cooperon amplitude inherits the phase factor from Eq.(14) and, therefore, becomes negative for  $\vec{k} \approx -\vec{p}$  where  $e^{i(\phi_k - \phi_p)} \approx -1$ , which configuration of the momenta provides a dominant contribution to the weak localization correction. Thus obtained, the negative sign of the Cooperon amplitude was claimed to be instrumental for the onset of antilocalizing behavior.

The validity of the above argument can be disputed by observing that the choice of a different (symmetrical) gauge for the Bloch wave functions

$$\begin{aligned} \psi'_{1k} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\pm e^{-i\phi_k/2}, e^{i\phi_k/2}, 0, 0), \\ \psi'_{2k} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (0, 0, e^{i\phi_k/2}, \pm e^{-i\phi_k/2}) \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

would result in a purely real matrix element  $\langle \vec{p}|u|\vec{k} \rangle \propto 2 \cos \frac{\phi_k - \phi_p}{2}$ , the use of which yields Eq.(14) without the said phase factor, hence the (deemed to be crucially important) sign change of the Cooperon amplitude does not seem to occur.

Although the observed gauge dependence of the Cooperon is perfectly consistent with its being a gauge non-invariant two-particle amplitude, the conductivity correction is, of course, supposed to be gauge invariant.

A resolution of such apparent contradiction goes as follows.

In fact, the vertex that ought to be used in the construction of the Cooperon is the particle-hole (exchange) amplitude  $W_{k,p,p,k}$  which is manifestly gauge invariant and given by Eq.(14) without the phase factor in question. In this regard, it is important to realize that the amplitudes  $W_{k,-k,p,-p} = W_{q,q-k,p,q-p}|_{q \rightarrow 0}$  and  $W_{k,p,p,k}|_{k \rightarrow -p}$  represent two non-commuting (and, in this particular case, unequal) limits of the general vertex (2).

On a side note, it might also be tempting to try to explain the experimentally found suppression of localization by the presence of the factor  $[1 + \cos(\phi_k - \phi_p)]$  vanishing for  $\vec{k} = -\vec{p}$  in Eq.(14). Notice, however, that the Cooperon built out of such a vertex lacks this factor, since the gapless pole develops for only one (namely,  $m = 0$ ) angular harmonic, whereas the other two harmonics that constitute the above angular-dependent factor ( $m = \pm 1$ ) receive only a finite enhancement by a factor of two.

Thus, an obvious suppression of the backward scattering off of an individual impurity (which fact has often been mentioned in the context of electron transport in 1D carbon nanotubes) does not necessarily imply the absence of (anti)localization in the deep diffusive regime in 2D graphene.

The true origin of the antilocalizing behavior exhibited by Eq.(11) for  $|g_1 - g_3| \ll |g_2 - g_4|$ , can be traced back to the negative signature of the expansion of the Cooperon mode  $C_4$  over the product basis  $\sigma_a \otimes \sigma_b$ , as opposed to that of  $C_1$  (see Eqs.(9)). Interpreting the sublattice index as a fictitious spin one-half ( $\vec{S}_{1,2} = \vec{\sigma}_{1,2}/2$ ), one can associate the  $C_4$  component with the singlet mode  $\hat{C}_4 \propto (\hat{1} \otimes \hat{1} - \frac{1}{2}(\vec{S}_1 + \vec{S}_2)^2)$  which, in the spin-orbit context, is known to be a common source of antilocalization.

In this regard, the present antilocalizing behavior is similar to that predicted in the case of 2DEG with a strong spin-orbit coupling of either Rashba or Dresselhaus kind<sup>12</sup>

$$H_{so} = \alpha(\hat{\sigma}_x k_y - \hat{\sigma}_y k_x) + \beta(\hat{\sigma}_x k_x - \hat{\sigma}_y k_y) \quad (16)$$

The details of the calculations presented above differ from those pertaining to the case of the spin-orbit coupling (for one thing, except for a splitting, the linear in momentum SO-coupling does not alter the fermion dispersion, whereas in the case of graphene it is the linear term which is solely responsible for the dispersion).

Yet another argument invoked by the authors of Ref.<sup>8</sup> to support their prediction of the antilocalizing behavior intermediate temperatures exploits the notion of the Berry phase associated with the electron wavefunctions (13).

Indeed, the first Chern number ("vorticity")

$$\Phi = i \oint \langle \psi_k | \vec{\nabla}_k | \psi_k \rangle, \quad (17)$$

where the momentum space integral is taken along any contour enclosing one of the Dirac points  $\vec{K}_{1,2}$ , yields

$\Phi_{1,2} = -\pi$  for both wavefunctions (13). In Ref.<sup>8</sup> (see also<sup>13</sup>) this observation was used to assert that the interference between any pair of counter-propagating electron waves becomes destructive, thereby giving way to the antilocalizing behavior.

However, the Berry phase (17) would be identically zero, if the wave functions (14) were used instead of (13), which suggests that its relationship with the Cooperon is somewhat more subtle. To that end, it is worth mentioning that the two Dirac species emerging in the continuous (low-energy) description of the original lattice system must have opposite chiralities<sup>14</sup>, as required for compliance with the ubiquitous Nielsen-Ninomiya ("fermion doubling") theorem<sup>15</sup>. In turn, this observation seems to suggest that, even if the Berry phases of the individual species happen to be finite ( $\Phi_{1,2} = \pm\pi$ ), they should still add up to zero.

A cancellation of the overall Berry phase would also be consistent with the vanishing of the quantum conductivity correction in the presence of equally strong intervalley backward and umklapp scattering, which, in effect, make the two Dirac points indistinguishable (the shortest reciprocal lattice vector becomes equivalent to  $\vec{K}_1 - \vec{K}_2$ ).

Recently, the role of the Berry phase has also been brought up in the context of the spin Hall effect generated by a spin-orbit coupling. Interestingly enough, the dependence of the spin Hall conductivity upon the coefficients  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  from Eq.(16) (and, especially, its exact vanishing at  $\alpha = \pm\beta$ ) can be established with the use of the Bloch wave functions in either asymmetrical (similar to Eq.(13)) or symmetrical (similar to Eq.(14)) gauge, where the corresponding Berry phase is non-zero and zero, respectively (cf., e.g., the two references in<sup>16</sup>). This observation, too, indicates that the relationship between the Berry phase and transport properties might be rather intricate.

Before concluding, a few more comments are in order.

In reality, the weak (anti)localization corrections are accompanied by the Aronov-Altshuler ones, which stem from the interference between disorder and Coulomb interactions. Despite a similar temperature dependence ( $\delta_{AA}\sigma_{xx} = -(e^2/\pi h) \ln(\gamma/T)$ ), the former, but not the latter, gets quenched by an applied magnetic field, thus allowing one to discriminate between the two.

Also, considering the potential attainability of the very low-density regime, it would be of interest to extend the analysis of the localization effects to the case  $\mu < \gamma$ . However, as we have already pointed out, in this regime a systematic expansion of the conductivity corrections would only be possible for an (unphysically) large number of valleys.

Moreover, even if this number were indeed large, the calculation itself would still pose a significant challenge. The main technical difficulty here is due to the double-pole structure of the Green functions (4), which results in the emergence of additional gapless Cooperon and diffusion modes in the RR (AA) channel, alongside the conventional (RA) one. A similar situation has been encoun-

tered in the context of dirty  $d$ -wave superconductors<sup>17,18</sup> where it has been argued that the quasiparticle conductivity receives additional logarithmic contributions from the processes involving RR (AA) Cooperons<sup>19</sup>.

Furthermore, the authors of Ref.<sup>19</sup> found the overall logarithmic correction to the spin (thermal) conductivity of normal  $d$ -wave quasiparticles to be negative, contrary to (in this case, ill-defined due to a non-conservation of charge) electrical one. In view of the formal differences between the Dirac-like descriptions of planar  $d$ -wave superconductors and graphene, it is, at least, conceivable that the correction to the electrical conductivity of graphene could change sign in the low-density regime, too.

Lastly, we comment on the possibility (as well as the need) of including other types of randomness. While the vertex (2) is devised as a general model of short-range (screened) impurities generating a random scalar potential, it obviously misses out on those types of disorder that can be best represented by either a random vector potential or a random mass of the Dirac fermions.

The latter might be relevant in the situation where a spatially inhomogeneous charge or spin density wave ordering sets in. In turn, the former can be utilized to describe extended lattice defects (dislocations, disclina-

tions, and cracks) in terms of a random magnetic flux<sup>6</sup>. In Ref.<sup>6</sup>, it was assumed that the corresponding random vector potential (rather than the flux) is  $\delta$ -correlated in space ( $\langle \vec{A}_q \vec{A}_{-q} \rangle = \text{const}$ ). Although this model possesses a conformal invariance and, therefore, can be analyzed in quite some detail<sup>17,20</sup>, a more adequate to the task would obviously be the model of a long-range correlated random vector potential ( $\langle \vec{A}_q \vec{A}_{-q} \rangle \propto 1/q^2$ ). The latter is known to show a rather different behavior even in the high-energy (ballistic) regime, as demonstrated in Ref.<sup>21</sup>.

A further investigation into these and related issues will be presented elsewhere.

In summary, we carried out a comprehensive analysis of the first-order quantum correction to the conductivity of doped graphene. We identified the conditions under which the conductivity correction becomes positive, negative, or zero. The earlier analysis of Ref.<sup>8</sup> has been critically assessed, and the open problems have been outlined.

This research was supported by NSF under Grant DMR-0349881. The author acknowledges valuable communications with E. Abrahams, A. Geim, V. Gusynin, and H. Suzuura.

- 
- <sup>1</sup> K. S. Noveslov et al, Science **306**, 666 (2004); Nature **438**, 197 (2005).
  - <sup>2</sup> Y. Zhang et al, Nature **438**, 201 (2005); Appl. Phys. Lett.**86**, 073104 (2005); Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 176803 (2005).
  - <sup>3</sup> G. Semenoff, Phys. Rev. Lett.**53**, 2449 (1984); F. D. M. Haldane, *ibid* **61**, 2015 (1988); E. Fradkin, Phys. Rev. **B33**, 3257 (1986); J.Gonzalez, F.Guinea, and M.A.H.Vozmediano, Nucl.Phys.**406**, 771 (1993); *ibid* **B424**, 595 (1994).
  - <sup>4</sup> V. P. Gusynin and S. G. Sharapov, Phys. Rev. Lett.**95**, 146801 (2005); cond-mat/0512157; N.M.R. Peres, F. Guinea, and A. H. Castro-Neto, cond-mat/0506709,0512091; E. McCann and V.I. Falko, cond-mat/0510237.
  - <sup>5</sup> G.P. Mikitik and Y.V. Sharlai, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 2147 (1999); I.A. Lukyanchuk and Y. Kopelevich, *ibid* **93**, 166402 (2004); Gusynin and S. G. Sharapov, Phys. Rev. **B71**, 125124 (2005).
  - <sup>6</sup> J. Gonzalez, F. Guinea, and M. A. H. Vozmediano, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 3589 (1996); Phys. Rev. **B59**, 2474 (1999); *ibid* **B63**, 134421 (2001); T. Stauber, F. Guinea, and M. A. H. Vozmediano, cond-mat/0311016; M.A.H.Vozmediano et al, cond-mat/0505557; N.M.R. Peres, F. Guinea, and A. H. Castro-Neto, cond-mat/0507061;0512091; J. Nilsson et al, cond-mat/0512360.
  - <sup>7</sup> D. V. Khveshchenko, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 206401 (2001); *ibid* **87**, 246802 (2001); E. V. Gorbar, V. P. Gusynin, V. A. Miransky, and I. A. Shovkovy, Phys. Rev. **B66**, 045108 (2002); D. V. Khveshchenko and H. Leal, Nucl. Phys. **B687**, 323 (2004); D. V. Khveshchenko and W. F. Shively, cond-mat/0510519.
  - <sup>8</sup> H. Suzuura and T. Ando, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 266603 (2002); J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **72**, 69 (2003).
  - <sup>9</sup> P.A. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett.**71**, 1887 (1993); A.C. Durst and P.A. Lee, Phys. Rev. **B62**, 1270 (2000).
  - <sup>10</sup> A. M. Shikin et al, Phys. Rev. Lett.**90**, 256803 (2003).
  - <sup>11</sup> A.L.Tchougreeff and R.Hoffmann, J. Phys. Chem.**96**, 8993 (1992); F.R.Wagner and M.B.Lepetit, *ibid* **100**, 11050 (1996).
  - <sup>12</sup> M.A. Skvortsov, JETP Lett.**67**, 133 (1998); I.V. Gornyi, A.P.Dmitriev, and V.Y. Kachorovskii, *ibid* **68**, 338 (1998); L.E. Golub, cond-mat/0412047.
  - <sup>13</sup> K.Y. Blioch, Phys. Lett. **A344**, 127 (2005).
  - <sup>14</sup> C.L.Kane and E.J. Mele, Phys Rev. Lett. **95**, 146802 (2005).
  - <sup>15</sup> H.B. Nielsen and M. Ninomiya, Nucl. Phys.**B185**, 20 (1981); *ibid* **B193**, 173 (1981).
  - <sup>16</sup> S.-Q. Shen, Phys. Rev. **B70**, 081311 (2004); N.A. Sinitsyn et al, *ibid* **70**, 081312 (2004).
  - <sup>17</sup> A.Altland and M.R.Zirnbauer, Phys.Rev.**B55**, 1142 (1997); A. Altland, B. D. Simons, and M. R. Zirnbauer, Phys. Rep. **359**, 283 (2002).
  - <sup>18</sup> D.V. Khveshchenko, A.G. Yashenkin, and I.V. Gornyi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 4668 (2001); A.G. Yashenkin et al, *ibid* **86**, 5982 (2001).
  - <sup>19</sup> Y.A.Yang et al, Euro. Phys. Lett. **63**, 111 (2003); Comm. Theor. Phys. **42**, 309 (2004).
  - <sup>20</sup> A. W. W. Ludwig, M. P. A. Fisher, R. Shankar, and G. Grinstein, Phys. Rev.**50**, 7526 (1994).
  - <sup>21</sup> D. V. Khveshchenko and A. G. Yashenkin, Phys. Lett. **A309**, p.363 (2003); Phys. Rev.**B67**, 052502 (2003).