

Therm o-Plasma Polariton within Scaling Theory of Single-Layer Graphene

Oskar Vafeek¹

¹Department of Physics, Stanford, California 94305, USA
(dated: December 28, 2021)

Electrodynamics of single-layer graphene is studied in the scaling regime. At any finite temperature, there is a weakly damped collective therm o-plasma polariton mode whose dispersion and wavelength dependent damping is determined analytically. The electric and magnetic fields associated with this mode decay exponentially in the direction perpendicular to the graphene layer, but unlike the surface plasma polariton modes of metals, the decay length and the mode frequency are strongly temperature dependent. This may lead to new ways of generation and manipulation of these modes.

There has been renewed interest in the electronic properties of the single layer graphene, spurred largely by the recent progress on the experimental front [1, 2]. Most of the experimental [1, 2, 3] and theoretical study [4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9] has focused on the electronic properties in the quantum Hall regime, where the massless relativistic dispersion of the electrons at low energies leads to effects absent in the conventional two dimensional electron gas.

On the other hand, the electronic properties of the single layer graphene in the absence of the external magnetic field are arguably as interesting as in the quantum Hall regime. The undoped system has effectively one particle per site, but two per unit cell of a honeycomb lattice, and in the non-interacting limit the valence and conduction bands touch at two inequivalent K points (see e.g. [10, 11]). To a very good approximation, the dispersion near these points is $\epsilon_k = v_F |k|$ up to ~ 1 eV, and the low energy excitations behave as 2D massless Dirac particles.

In the weak coupling regime, the role of the electron-electron interactions at zero temperature has been studied previously in a series of papers [12, 13, 14], but because the results are scattered across the literature, it is useful to review and interpret the main conclusions here. Since there are no mobile carriers at $T = 0$, the Coulomb interactions are not screened and the usual Fermi liquid arguments do not guarantee sharp quasiparticle excitations at the Fermi point. The strength of the electron-electron interactions can be parameterized by a dimensionless coupling constant $\alpha_F = e^2 / (\epsilon_0 v_F)$, where ϵ_0 is the bare dielectric constant due to the polarizability of the core electron bands. α_F is of order one. Standard renormalization group (RG) arguments show that in 2D the charge e is exactly marginal [15, 16], and therefore any RG flow of α_F is due to the renormalization of v_F . In weak coupling the scale dependent v_F grows under RG as $v_F(k) = v_F^{(0)} + \frac{e^2}{8} \log \frac{k_F}{k}$ and therefore α_F decreases, resulting in the effective weakening of the electron-electron interactions. The growth of v_F is eventually bounded by c , the speed of light, and at the eventual infra-red fixed point the full retarded interaction between electrons mediated by photons must be taken into account. This fixed point is charged, with electrons moving at the speed of light,

and it is almost certainly not a Fermi liquid. Unfortunately, its character, while fascinating, remains only of academic interest since $c/v_F \sim 300$ and it would be impossible to probe the system across scales differing by hundreds of orders of magnitude. The physical properties of the system are then given by a large crossover regime dominated by the non-retarded Coulomb interactions, which, at least in weak coupling can be described within perturbative RG.

The absence of the screening at $T = 0$ leads to the absence of any well defined plasma oscillations. However, as shown below, at any finite temperature, there is a finite non-activated density of thermally excited quasiparticles which can screen the Coulomb interactions. Their coupling to the three dimensional electromagnetic radiation leads to a therm o-plasma polariton mode with frequency vanishing as $\omega_p = \sqrt{c^2 k^2}$ but crossing over into $\omega_p = (k_B T)^{-1} t(t+g) = t + 2g$, where $g = e^2 N \ln 2 = (2 v_F)^{-1}$, $N = 4$ is the number of two component Dirac species, and $t = v_F |k|$ ($k_B T$). The crossover wavelength is inversely proportional to temperature and is of the order of a millimeter at room temperature. The electromagnetic fields are confined to the two-dimensional graphene sheet within the attenuation length λ_a , which prevents the energy from radiating outwards. The analytical expressions for ω_p , λ_a , and the propagation length, λ , are the main results of this paper. While surface plasma polaritons have been discussed in metals long time ago [17], the strong temperature dependence of the dispersion and the propagation length of the therm o-plasma polaritons, as well as their confinement to the atomically thin graphene sheet, may open new opportunities in the emerging field of plasmonics [18, 19].

To justify the above claims, I start by solving the Maxwell equations in the presence of a graphene sheet. The speed of light c is taken as a variable and not necessarily equal to the speed of light in the vacuum. This allows for situations where the graphene sheet is positioned between two dielectrics. In the scaling regime, all energy scales can be measured in units of $k_B T$ and all lengths can be measured in the units of thermal length $\lambda_T = v_F / (k_B T)$, where v_F is the Fermi velocity at the nodal points. As mentioned above, the strength of $e-e$

interactions is given by the dimensionless coupling constant, ϵ_F which is the graphene analog of the fine structure constant. Since the logarithmic corrections to v_F do not change the main physics discussed below, for the purposes of this article these corrections will be neglected.

Within the linear response theory the effective Lagrangian for the electromagnetic gauge field is

$$L_{\text{eff}} = \frac{1}{2} \int d^3x \left[\epsilon^{(0)} \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{A} + \frac{1}{2} [a_{ij} + b_{ij}] \partial_i \mathbf{A} \cdot \partial_j \mathbf{A} \right] \quad (1)$$

where, $A_{\mathbf{j}=0} = \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} A(\mathbf{k}, z)$ and for the sake of brevity, the dependence of A on ω and \mathbf{k} was suppressed. In the Lorenz gauge the Fourier components of the polarization tensors [20] are

$$\epsilon^{(0)} = \frac{\omega^2}{c^2} + k^2 + k_z^2 \epsilon_g \quad (2)$$

$$a_{ij} = g^F \delta_{ij} - \frac{q_i q_j}{q^2} - \frac{q_i^2}{v_F^2 k^2} \delta_{ij} - \frac{q_j^2}{q^2} g^F \quad (3)$$

$$b_{ij} = \frac{v_F^2}{c^2} \epsilon_{ijkl} \frac{k_l k_m}{k^2} \quad (4)$$

where \mathbf{q} runs from 0 to 3 while $i, j = 0; 1; 2; 3$; $q_i = (\omega; v_F \mathbf{k})$, so $q^2 = \omega^2 + v_F^2 k^2$. The diagonal tensor $g_{00} = g_{11} = g_{22} = g_{33} = 1$ while $ig_{00}^F = \frac{c}{v_F} g_{11}^F = \frac{c}{v_F} g_{22}^F = 1, g_{33}^F = 0$.

In the scaling regime, the polarization functions depend only on $\omega, v_F k$, and T . All the energy (length) scales can be measured in $k_B T$ ($\hbar T$) since the response is due to the excitations around the nodal points, and therefore the polarization has the scaling form

$$a_{ijb} = a_{ijb}(\omega; v_F k; T) = \frac{\hbar T}{k_B T} P_{a_{ijb}}(\omega; v_F k; T; N) \quad (5)$$

where the dependence on the dimensionless coupling constant $\epsilon_F = e^2/(4\pi\epsilon_0 v_F)$, and the number of nodal points

N , was included explicitly on the right hand side. So far, the only approximation used is the linearity of the electromagnetic response and the existence of the scaling regime with vanishing anomalous dimension.

The equations of motion (Maxwell's equations) for the gauge field

$$\frac{\omega^2}{c^2} \mathbf{k}^2 + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} \mathbf{g} \cdot \mathbf{A}(z) = \mathbf{j}(z) [a_{ij} + b_{ij}] A_{\mathbf{j}}(z)$$

are invariant under rotations inside the plane as well as simultaneous scale transformation of space-time and thermal length. Therefore in the scaling regime, any solution must satisfy

$$\mathbf{j}(\mathbf{k}; k_z; T) = \frac{k_B T}{\hbar} W(\mathbf{j}; \mathbf{k}; k_z) \quad (6)$$

Clearly the z -component of \mathbf{A} decouples from the rest and obeys the standard wave-equation. To proceed, we find the common (normalized) eigenvectors of a_{ij} and b_{ij} and decouple the Eq. (6). This orthogonal triad is $\mathbf{e}^{(k)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \mathbf{j}$, $\mathbf{e}^{(a)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\mathbf{j} \times \mathbf{k})$, and $\mathbf{e}^{(b)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \mathbf{k} \times \mathbf{j}$ where $\mathbf{k} = (\omega; c\mathbf{k})$, and \mathbf{j} is the completely antisymmetric rank 4 tensor. Projecting \mathbf{A} along the four eigenvectors we have

$$\mathbf{A} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} e^{(k)} A_k + e^{(a)} A_a + e^{(b)} A_b + A_z \quad (7)$$

Note that

$$a_{ij} A_{\mathbf{j}} = \frac{v_F^2 \omega^2 + v_F^2 k^2}{\omega^2 + v_F^2 k^2} e^{(a)} A_a \quad (8)$$

$$b_{ij} A_{\mathbf{j}} = \frac{v_F^2}{c^2} e^{(b)} A_b \quad (9)$$

The Maxwell's equations then decouple to

$$\frac{\omega^2}{c^2} + k^2 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} \frac{\omega^2 + c^2 k^2}{\omega^2 + c^2 k^2} A_k(z) - \frac{2! c k j}{\omega^2 + c^2 k^2} A_a(z) = 0; \quad (10)$$

$$\frac{\omega^2}{c^2} + k^2 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} \frac{2! c k j}{\omega^2 + c^2 k^2} A_k(z) + \frac{\omega^2}{\omega^2 + c^2 k^2} A_a(z) + \frac{v_F^2 \omega^2 + v_F^2 k^2}{\omega^2 + v_F^2 k^2} A_a(z) = 0; \quad (11)$$

$$\frac{\omega^2}{c^2} + k^2 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} A_b(z) + \frac{v_F^2}{c^2} A_b(z) = 0; \quad (12)$$

$$\frac{\omega^2}{c^2} + k^2 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} A_z(z) = 0; \quad (13)$$

If $c^2 k^2 \ll \omega^2$ and if we let $A_k = A_a \frac{2! c k j}{\omega^2 + c^2 k^2} (\omega^2 + c^2 k^2)$, then the first equation is automatically satisfied and the

Lorenz condition $\frac{1}{c} A_0 + k_i A_i + k_z A_z = 0$ is satisfied provided that $A_z(z) = \text{constant}$. Fourier transforming

into the real space along z-direction we finally have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\omega^2}{c^2} k^2 + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} A_a(z) &= \left(z \frac{v_F^2}{c^2} \omega^2 - \frac{v_F^2}{c^2} k^2 \right) A_a(z) \\ \frac{\omega^2}{c^2} k^2 + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} A_b(z) &= \left(z \frac{v_F^2}{c^2} \omega^2 - \frac{v_F^2}{c^2} k^2 \right) A_b(z) \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

The above equations resemble a Schrodinger equation for a particle moving along a line and experiencing a function potential. If the potential is attractive, we know that there is one bound state, otherwise there are only scattering states. In this case, the potential depends on the frequency ω , on the inplane wavevector k and on the temperature. The bound state solutions correspond to the evanescent electromagnetic waves whose vector potentials A_a and A_b have the form

$$A_{a,b}(\omega, k; z; \frac{v_F}{c}) = A_{a,b}(0) e^{-\alpha_{a,b}(z)} \quad (15)$$

and whose inverse attenuation lengths satisfy $\alpha_a^{-1} = \frac{v_F^2}{c^2} \omega^2 - \frac{v_F^2}{c^2} k^2 = \omega^2 - \frac{v_F^2}{c^2} k^2$ and $\alpha_b^{-1} = \frac{v_F^2}{c^2} \omega^2 - \frac{v_F^2}{c^2} k^2$. The real part of $\alpha_{a,b}$ must be positive and ω and k must satisfy

$$4 \alpha_{a,b}^2 = \frac{\omega^2}{c^2} + k^2 = 1 \quad (16)$$

The condition $\langle e[\alpha_{a,b}] \rangle > 0$ thus specifies a region in (ω, k) -space where the curve given by the solution of Eq.(16) must lie.

Using the scaling form of the polarization functions, Eq.(5), gives the scaling form of the attenuation lengths

$$\alpha_{a,b}(\omega; v_F, k; T) = \frac{1}{k_B T} X_{a,b} \frac{\omega}{k} \frac{v_F}{c} \quad (17)$$

Eq.(16) can then be written in terms of the dimensionless scaling variables $s = \frac{\omega}{k_B T}$, $t = \frac{v_F k}{k_B T}$

$$4 X_{a,b}^2 s^2 t^2 \frac{v_F}{c} \frac{v_F}{c} \frac{v_F}{c} N = \frac{v_F^2}{c^2} s^2 + t^2 = 1 \quad (18)$$

Therefore any solution of this equation must have the scaling form $s = s(t; \frac{v_F}{c}; \frac{v_F}{c} N)$ which is equivalent to Eq.(6). For purely real $X_{a,b}$ this equation sets the bound for allowed frequencies $\omega_k = c k$.

To proceed, we need to resort to approximations for $\alpha_{a,b}$. Consider first α_a . Within the random phase approximation, we find [21][14] that for $s^2 > t^2$ the polarization scaling function (5) $P_{\pm}(s; t)$ $\frac{1}{F N} \frac{\ln 2 t^2 s^2}{t^2} \frac{1}{s^2} \frac{1}{c^2} \frac{1}{s^2} \frac{1}{t^2} \tanh \frac{s}{4}$: Using the above approximation, the Eq. (16) can be solved by first ignoring the imaginary part of α_a and then including it perturbatively. Then, to 0th order $\frac{g^2}{t^4} t^2 \frac{v_F^2}{c^2} s^2 = 1$, where $g =$




FIG. 1: (Black) The dispersion of the thermo-plasma-polariton mode in terms of the dimensionless scaling variables $s = \frac{\omega}{k_B T} = \frac{\omega}{(131 \text{ GHz}) (K \text{ elvin} = T)}$ and $t = \frac{v_F k}{k_B T} = \frac{v_F k}{(61 \text{ m}^{-1} \text{ K elvin} = T)}$. At small momenta, the dispersion asymptotes to the light cone (red). Above the crossover scale $t_c = \frac{g}{c} \frac{c^2}{v_F^2} = \frac{c^2}{v_F^2}$, the dispersion is given by $s = \frac{t}{t + g} = \frac{t}{t + 2g}$, where the effective electron-electron interaction strength is $g = e^2 N \ln 2 = (2 \sim v_F)$. For orientation, at room temperature and for $k_j^{-1} = 400 \text{ nm}^{-1}$, $\omega_p = 6 \text{ THz}$.

$F N \ln 2 = (2)$. This is a cubic equation in s^2 and so a closed form solution exists. The expression is too long to present here but the solution is plotted in Fig.1. In the low k regime the dispersion follows the light cone, i.e. in the scaling variables $s \approx \frac{c}{v_F} t$. At a crossover scale $t_c = \frac{g}{c} \frac{c^2}{v_F^2} = \frac{c^2}{v_F^2}$, the dispersion changes to $s = \frac{t}{t + g} = \frac{t}{t + 2g}$. The physical origin behind these two regimes can be understood as follows: if the interaction between the electrons were replaced by an instantaneous Coulomb interaction, the plasma mode would continue dispersing as $s_{\text{Coulomb}} = \frac{t}{t + g} = \frac{t}{t + 2g}$ even for vanishing t . However, at the crossover scale t_c , the light cone crosses s_{Coulomb} and the two mix. This is the plasmon-polariton effect.

As $v_F = c \rightarrow 0$, the light cone regime regime shrinks as $g v_F^2 = (2c^2)$ and

$$s = \frac{t}{t + g} \frac{1}{4 \ln 2} \frac{g^2 t}{2g + t} \tanh \frac{t}{4} \frac{t + g}{t + 2g} \quad (19)$$

The imaginary part of the frequency is the k dependent inverse lifetime of the monochromatic plasmon-polariton mode and has its origin in the electron-hole scattering of the collective mode. The distance over which the mode propagates, the propagation length ℓ , has a scaling form as well, and it is given by the product of the lifetime and the phase velocity $\ell = \frac{1}{\gamma} \langle e[s] \rangle = (t \text{ m} [s])$. This quantity




FIG. 2: The thermoplasma polariton (in-plane) propagation length, ℓ , (dashed red) and the (out-of-plane) attenuation length, ξ_a , (solid black) normalized to thermal length ($\ell_T = \hbar v_F / (k_B T)$) vs. the mode frequency, ω_p , normalized by $k_B T = \hbar \omega_p$. At room temperature and for $\omega_p = 20$ THz, $\ell \approx 2$ nm.

is plotted in Fig. (2) for $N = 4$ and $v_F = 8 \times 10^6$ m/s. Meanwhile, note that, within the same approximation for ω_p , there is no weakly damped solution to Eq.(16).

Finally, given the scalar A_0 and vector potential A_i solution for the evanescent wave, the electric and magnetic field distributions associated with the solution can be determined. While the magnetic field is always transverse, the electric field has a component perpendicular to the graphene sheet. Up to an overall scale, its in-plane Fourier components are

$$B = \hat{z} \times \hat{k} \frac{\text{sgn}(z)}{2a} \frac{p \sqrt{1^2 + c^2 k^2}}{c^2 k^2 \sqrt{1^2}} e^{\frac{z-j}{2a}}; \quad (20)$$

$$E = \frac{\hat{k}}{ic} (1^2 + c^2 k^2) + \hat{z} \text{sgn}(z) \frac{c k j}{2} \frac{p \sqrt{1^2 + c^2 k^2}}{c^2 k^2 \sqrt{1^2}} e^{\frac{z-j}{2a}}; \quad (21)$$

The fields are thus bound to the surface which prevents the power from radiating away from the graphene sheet.

While most of the results presented here concern ungated graphene, the effects of applied gate voltage can be easily taken into account within the scaling theory. Finite gate voltage V_g introduces another energy scale which must be compared to $k_B T$. If $V_g \ll k_B T$ then the results presented above hold. If $V_g \gg k_B T$, then the thermal energy (length) scale $k_B T$, (ℓ_T), must be replaced by V_g or by $\hbar v_F / V_g$ respectively.

Experimentally, the temperature dependent attenuation of the EM fields perpendicular to the layer can be measured using near field optical microscopy, while the dispersion can be measured, for instance, by inelastic light scattering.

There are certain similarities between the thermoplasma polaritons discussed here and the surface plasma polaritons in thin metals. In particular in both cases the evanescent electromagnetic fields prevent the power from radiating outwards. However, in the case of the surface plasma polaritons, the dispersion is essentially fixed by the electron density and does not depend significantly on temperature (or gate voltage). This is in sharp contrast to the strong temperature and gate voltage dependence of the properties of the thermoplasma polaritons, the local manipulation of either of which may open new ways to generate and waveguide these modes.

I wish to acknowledge useful discussions with Prof. Mark Brongersma, Steve Kivelson and Zlatko Teseanovic. This work was supported in part by the Stanford ITP fellowship.

[1] K. S. Novoselov, A. K. Geim, S. V. Morozov, D. Jiang, M. I. Katsnelson, I. V. Grigorieva, S. V. Dubonos, and A. A. Firsov, *Nature* 438, 197 (2005).
[2] Y. Zhang, Y. W. Tan, H. L. Stormer, and P. Kim, *Nature* 438, 201 (2005).
[3] Y. Zhang, Z. Jiang, J. P. Small, M. S. Purewal, Y. W. Tan, M. Fazlollahi, J. D. Chudow, J. A. Jaszczak, H. L. Stormer, and P. Kim, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 96, 136806 (2006).
[4] V. P. Gusynin and S. G. Sharapov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 95, 146801 (2005).
[5] D. A. Abanin, P. A. Lee, and L. S. Levitov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 96, 176803 (2006).
[6] A. H. C. Neto, F. Guinea, and N. M. R. Peres, *Phys. Rev. B* 73, 205408 (2006).
[7] K. Nomura and A. H. MacDonald, *cond-mat/0604113*.
[8] J. Alicea and M. P. A. Fisher, *cond-mat/0604601*.
[9] V. Gusynin, V. Miransky, S. Sharapov, and I. Shovkovy, *cond-mat/0605348*.
[10] P. R. Wallace, *Phys. Rev.* 71, 622 (1947).
[11] M. Wilson, *Physics Today* 59, 21 (2006).
[12] J. Gonzalez, F. Guinea, and M. A. H. Vozmediano, *Nucl. Phys. B* 424, 595 (1994).
[13] J. Gonzalez, F. Guinea, and M. A. H. Vozmediano, *Phys. Rev. B* 59, R2474 (1999).
[14] D. V. Khveshchenko, *cond-mat/0604180*.
[15] M. P. A. Fisher, G. G. Rinstein, and S. M. Girvin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 64, 587 (1990).
[16] I. F. Herbut, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 87, 137004 (2001).
[17] D. Sarid, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 47, 1927 (1981).
[18] W. L. Barnes, A. Dereux, and T. W. Ebbesen, *Nature* 424, 824 (2003).
[19] R. Zia, M. D. Selker, P. B. Catrysse, and M. L. Brongersma, *J. Opt. Soc. Am. A* 21, 2442 (2004).
[20] O. Vafek and Z. Teseanovic, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 91, 237001 (2003).
[21] O. Vafek, Ph.D. thesis, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland (2003).