

Kramers-Krönig relation of graphene conductivity

Daqing Liu and Shengli Zhang

Department of Applied Physics, Xi'an Jiaotong university, Xi'an, 710049, China

Abstract

Utilizing a complete Lorentz-covariant and local-gauge-invariant formulation, we discuss graphene response to arbitrary external electric field. The relation, which is called as Kramers-Krönig relation in the paper, between imaginary part and real part of ac conductivity is given. We point out there exists an ambiguity in the conductivity computing, attributed to the wick behavior at ultraviolet vicinity. We argue that to study electrical response of graphene completely, non-perturbational contribution should be considered.

PACS numbers: 71.10.-w,72.10.Bg,73.63.-b

1 Introduction

Graphene, a flat monolayer of carbon atoms tightly packed into a two-dimensional honeycomb lattice, has spawned many theoretical and experimental focuses. As stated in ref. [1], graphene plays the role of bridge between condensed physics and high energy physics. This is attributed to massless Dirac fermion behavior of quasi-electron in graphene, *i.e.* we can treat the quasielectrons in graphene as ultimately relativity particles.

Such behavior also arouses many unusual properties of graphene, such as ac and dc conductivity. Many attentions [2-5] are on such topic. However, there exist discrepancies in the problem, including the discrepancy between theories and experiments on dc conductivity, the famous missing " $\frac{1}{\pi}$ factor", and confliction among different theoretical calculations [6]. So far different theories are almost based on the perturbational approximation, even calculations may be did by multi-loop diagrams [7].

We introduce a correlation function with respect to only one variable, the invariant amplitude of spatial-time position, x , to study the graphene conductivity non-perturbationally. From the correlation function, we show there is relation between imaginary part and real part of ac conductivity. The function is very close to spectral function and we find that the perturbational calculations to conductivity only include contributions from free valence-conduction electron pairs. Therefore, besides these contributions, to compute conductivity completely we should also consider other ones, such as excitation or impurity. To check the statement, we perform a perturbational calculation of dc conductivity using the quantum field theory. This technique guarantees that the for-

mulation is Lorentz-covariant and local-gauge-invariant. We point out that there exists discrepancy among different theoretical calculations, attributed to bad behaviors at ultraviolet vicinity of δ -functions.

We organize the paper as following: In section 2, we discuss the electrical response to arbitrary external electric field. A discussion on obtaining dc conductivity utilizing Kubo theory [8] is also given. The relation between imaginary part and real part of ac conductivity is listed in section 3. We show an explicit perturbational computing for conductivity in section 4 and a brief discussion in section 5.

2 The conductivity under arbitrary external fields

To perform the calculation we first give the second quantization on graphene briefly. Lagrangian density is

$$\mathcal{L} = \bar{\psi}(i\gamma_\mu\partial^\mu - m)\psi, \quad (1)$$

where $\partial^\mu = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_\mu}$, $\bar{\psi} = \psi^\dagger\gamma_0$, m is the mass of quasiparticle (To clarify we here endow the quasielectrons with a nonzero mass), and γ 's are

$$\gamma_0 = \beta = \tau_3, \gamma_1 = \beta\tau_1, \gamma_2 = \beta\tau_2,$$

where τ_1, τ_2 and τ_3 are three Pauli matrices. In the paper, the repeated indices are generally summed, unless otherwise indicated. Furthermore, $\hbar = v_F = e = 1$ are always set.

The Hamiltonian is then [5]

$$H = \int d^2\mathbf{r}\psi^\dagger(\mathbf{r})\beta(-i\gamma_i\partial^i + m)\psi(\mathbf{r}). \quad (2)$$

Here, Latin indices i, j , etc. generally run over two spatial coordinate labels, 1, 2. (While Greek indices μ, ν , and so on, three spatial-time coordinate labels 0, 1, 2 with x_0 the time coordinate.)

Under the second quantization, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\psi(\mathbf{x}) &= \int \frac{d^2\mathbf{p}}{(2\pi)^2\sqrt{2p_0}} [a_{\mathbf{p}}u(\mathbf{p})e^{-ipx} + b_{\mathbf{p}}^\dagger v(\mathbf{p})e^{ipx}], \\ \bar{\psi}(\mathbf{x}) &= \int \frac{d^2\mathbf{p}}{(2\pi)^2\sqrt{2p_0}} [a_{\mathbf{p}}^\dagger \bar{u}(\mathbf{p})e^{ipx} + b_{\mathbf{p}}\bar{v}(\mathbf{p})e^{-ipx}],\end{aligned}$$

where $p_0 = \sqrt{m^2 + \mathbf{p}^2} > 0$. Solutions to positive energy $u(\mathbf{p})$ and to negative energy $v(\mathbf{p})$ satisfy respectively

$$\begin{aligned}u^\dagger u &= 2p_0, \bar{u}u = 2m, u\bar{u} = \not{p} + m, \\ v^\dagger v &= 2p_0, \bar{v}v = -2m, v\bar{v} = \not{p} - m.\end{aligned}\quad (3)$$

The explicit forms of u and v are irrelevant. For simplification, we call operator $a_{\mathbf{p}}^\dagger(a_{\mathbf{p}})$, which creates(annihilates) quasidelectron in conduction band, as creation(annihilation) operator which creates(annihilates) electron, at the same time, we call operator $b_{\mathbf{p}}^\dagger(b_{\mathbf{p}})$, which annihilates(creates) electron in valance band, as creation(annihilation) operator which creates(annihilates) hole. Both electron and hole have positive energy, p_0 .

Since in the perturbational ground state, the valance band is completely filled while the conduction band is empty, the energy of the ground state is nonzero, $E_{gnd} = -\int d^2\mathbf{p}\sqrt{m^2 + \mathbf{p}^2}$. To obtain a Lorentz invariant ground state, we perform a subtraction for all the states, $E \rightarrow E - E_{gnd}$. Under such subtraction, each physics quantity, such as energy, current, etc. should be in normal form [9].

With the substitution $i\partial_\mu \rightarrow p_\mu$, we read Hamiltonian operator eventually

$$H = \int d^2\mathbf{p}p_0(a_{\mathbf{p}}^\dagger a_{\mathbf{p}} + b_{\mathbf{p}}^\dagger b_{\mathbf{p}}).\quad (4)$$

When concerning of electromagnetic interactions we should make a substitution of $p_\mu \rightarrow p_\mu - eA_\mu$ in Eq. (2). Denoting $A_\mu = g_{\mu\nu}A^\nu$ with metric matrix $g = \text{diag}\{1, -1, -1\}$, the interacting Lagrangian density is $\mathcal{L}_{int} = -e\bar{\psi}\gamma_\mu\psi A^\mu = -J_\mu A^\mu$ and the corresponding Hamiltonian is

$$H_{int} = -\int d^2\mathbf{x}\mathcal{L}_{int} = \int d^2\mathbf{x}J_\mu(\mathbf{x})A^\mu(\mathbf{x}),\quad (5)$$

where, just as pointed out above, $J_\mu(x)$ is in norm form:

$$\begin{aligned}J_\mu(x) &=: \bar{\psi}\gamma_\mu\psi(\mathbf{x}) : \\ &= \int \frac{d^2\mathbf{p}d^2\mathbf{p}'}{(2\pi)^4\sqrt{2p_0p'_0}} \{a_{\mathbf{p}}^\dagger a_{\mathbf{p}'} e^{i(p-p')x} \bar{u}(\mathbf{p})\gamma_\mu u(\mathbf{p}') \\ &\quad + a_{\mathbf{p}}^\dagger b_{\mathbf{p}'}^\dagger e^{i(p+p')x} \bar{u}(\mathbf{p})\gamma_\mu v(\mathbf{p}') \\ &\quad + b_{\mathbf{p}} a_{\mathbf{p}'} e^{-i(p+p')x} \bar{v}(\mathbf{p})\gamma_\mu u(\mathbf{p}') \\ &\quad - b_{\mathbf{p}}^\dagger b_{\mathbf{p}'} e^{-i(p-p')x} \bar{v}(\mathbf{p})\gamma_\mu v(\mathbf{p}')\}.\end{aligned}$$

Unlike some papers, we here introduce a factor $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2p_0}}$ associated with momentum integration, which is attributed to the Lorentz covariant [9,10].

Both the electron number and the hole number are conservative without interaction. However, the only conservation quantity is their difference when interactions are included,

$$N = \int d^2\mathbf{x} : \psi^\dagger\psi := \int \frac{d^2\mathbf{p}}{(2\pi)^2} (a_{\mathbf{p}}^\dagger a_{\mathbf{p}} - b_{\mathbf{p}}^\dagger b_{\mathbf{p}}).\quad (6)$$

Generally, the interacting Hamiltonian of graphene in external field $A^\mu(x_0, \mathbf{x})$ is described by Eq. (5). The density operator is $\rho = \rho_0 + \delta\rho$, where ρ_0 is the equilibrium density operator and $\delta\rho$ is the leading order correction with respect to the external field.

In Heisenberg picture we have

$$i\delta\rho(x_0) = [H_{int}, \rho_0].\quad (7)$$

Therefore [2],

$$\delta\rho(x_0) = -i \int_{-\infty}^{x_0} dx'_0 d\mathbf{x}' [J_\mu(x'_0, \mathbf{x}'), \rho_0] A^\mu(x'_0, \mathbf{x}').\quad (8)$$

Due to the spatial and time translation invariant, at zero temperature, on fixed time x_0^0 , the current density at arbitrary position is

$$\begin{aligned}\langle J_\mu(x_0^0) \rangle &= \text{Tr}(\delta\rho(x_0^0) J_\mu(x_0^0, \mathbf{0})) \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^0 dx_0 d^2\mathbf{x} T_{\mu\nu}(x_0, \mathbf{x}) A^\nu(x_0 + x_0^0, \mathbf{x}),\end{aligned}\quad (9)$$

where

$$T_{\mu\nu}(x_0, \mathbf{x}) = i \langle [J_\nu(x_0, \mathbf{x}), J_\mu(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0})] \rangle\quad (10)$$

with the notation of the ground state $|\rangle$.

Noticing in Eq. (9) and (10), variable x_0 is defined on $(-\infty, 0)$, we expand the range of x_0 onto $(-\infty, \infty)$ as

$$\begin{aligned}T_{\mu\nu}(x) &= i\theta(x_0) \langle [J_\mu(0), J_\nu(x)] \rangle \\ &\quad + i\theta(-x_0) \langle [J_\nu(x), J_\mu(0)] \rangle,\end{aligned}\quad (11)$$

where $\theta(x_0)$ is step function: $\theta(x_0) = 1$ for $x_0 \geq 0$, $\theta(x_0) = 0$ for $x_0 < 0$. Tensor $T_{\mu\nu}(x)$ is vanishing for

space-like x , *i.e.* the support of tensor $T_{\mu\nu}$ is time-like three-dimensional vector x .

Our expansion is different to the one in Ref. [2], where $T_{\mu\nu}$ has only forward term or backward term.

The conductivity should be independent on the gauge transformation. This means that, under a local gauge transformation $A^\nu \rightarrow A'^\nu = A^\nu - \partial^\nu f$, where f is arbitrary function with $f(x_0 = x_0^0) = f(x_0 = -\infty) = 0$, the current density in Eq. (9) should be invariant. Integrating Eq. (9) by part we find that this requirement is satisfied provided $\partial^\nu T_{\mu\nu} = 0$ everywhere. The statement can be proven by the facts: 1) charge conservation, *i.e.* $\partial^\nu J_\nu \equiv 0$; 2) $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_\mu} \theta(x_0) = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x_\mu} \theta(-x_0) = \delta_{0\mu} \delta(x_0)$; 3) the equal time commutation relation $[J_0(t\mathbf{x}), J_\mu(t\mathbf{y})] = 0$.

$T_{\mu\nu}(x)$ is written as

$$T_{\mu\nu}(x) = -(\partial_\mu \partial_\nu - g_{\mu\nu} \square) \Pi(x), \quad (12)$$

where $\square \equiv \partial^\mu \partial_\mu = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_0^2} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_1^2} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_2^2}$, $\Pi(x)$ is scalar function with respect to only one variable, invariant amplitude of three-dimensional spatial-time vector x . After defining the Fourier transformation of function $f(x)$ as $f(q) = \int d\mathbf{x} dt f(x) e^{i q x}$ with $q x \equiv q_\mu x^\mu$, we have, then,

$$T_{\mu\nu}(q) = (q_\mu q_\nu - q^2 g_{\mu\nu}) \Pi(q^2), \quad (13)$$

where $\Pi(q^2)$ is the only function with respect to invariant amplitude of q .

From Eq. (9) it seems that J_μ is time dependent in the time-invariant external electric field. But this is not true. It is enough to illustrate it by a special gauge, $A^\nu = (0, E x^0, 0)$ or $A_\nu = (0, -E x_0, 0)$, where A is three-dimensional potential and E is the external electric field, $E_\nu = (E, 0)$. It is easily to see that

$$J_\mu(x_0^0) = -E \int_{-\infty}^0 \frac{dx_0 dq_0}{2\pi} e^{-i q_0 x_0} g_{\mu 1} q_0^2 \Pi(q_0) (x_0 + x_0^0), \quad (14)$$

where $\Pi(q_0) \equiv \Pi(q_0^2, \mathbf{q} = \mathbf{0})$. J_0 (charge density) and J_2 are both vanishing and only $J_1 \neq 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} J_1(x_0^0) &= E \int \frac{dq_0}{2\pi} q_0^2 \Pi(q_0^2) \int_{-\infty}^{x_0^0} dx_0 x_0 e^{i q_0 x_0 + \epsilon x_0} e^{i q_0 x_0^0} \\ &= E \int \frac{dq_0}{2\pi} \Pi(q_0^2) \frac{q_0^2}{q_0^2 + i q_0 \epsilon} (1 + i q_0 x_0^0) \\ &\equiv E \sigma(x_0^0), \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where the additional factor $e^{\epsilon x_0}$ (ϵ is a positive infinitesimal) is to guarantee that the external field is introduced adiabatically. When $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, $\frac{q_0^2}{q_0^2 + i q_0 \epsilon} \rightarrow 1$, we can replace $\frac{q_0^2}{q_0^2 + i q_0 \epsilon}$ by unitary. Furthermore, since $\Pi(q_0^2)$ is even function of q_0 , $\int \frac{dq_0}{2\pi} \Pi(q_0^2) i q_0 x_0 \equiv 0$. We finally

have a time-independent conductivity

$$\sigma = \int \frac{dq_0}{2\pi} \Pi(q_0^2) \equiv \Pi(x_0 = 0, \mathbf{q} = \mathbf{0}), \quad (16)$$

where, to obtain a meaningful quantity, we should perform a subtraction of Π , *i.e.* we make a substitution: $\Pi(x_0 = 0, \mathbf{q} = \mathbf{0}) \rightarrow \Pi(x_0 = 0, \mathbf{q} = \mathbf{0}) - \Pi(x_0 = -\infty, \mathbf{q} = \mathbf{0})$. In Fourier space, this subtraction is the substitution $\Pi(q_0, \mathbf{q}) \rightarrow \Pi(q_0, \mathbf{q}) - \Pi(q_0 = 0, \mathbf{q})$. In the paper, we always make such subtraction for all the physical quantities.

As expected, we obtain a time-independent current density for a steady external field.

It is not difficult to deduce the response to arbitrary external fields. Supposing the external electric field is ac with frequency ω , $A = (0, E_0 e^{i\omega x_0}, 0) e^{\epsilon x_0}$ and substituting the potential into expression (9), we find that only x-component of current density is nonvanishing,

$$J_1(x_0) = E_0 e^{i\omega x_0} \int \frac{dq_0}{2\pi} \Pi(q_0^2, \mathbf{0}) \frac{i q_0^2}{q_0 - \omega + i\epsilon}. \quad (17)$$

Since this potential stands for external electric field $(E_1, E_2) = (i\omega E_0 e^{i\omega x_0}, 0)$, the complex conductivity is

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma &= \int \frac{dq_0}{2\pi} \Pi(q_0^2, \mathbf{0}) \frac{q_0^2}{\omega(q_0 - \omega + i\epsilon)} \\ &= \frac{1}{\omega} \int \frac{dq_0}{2\pi} \Pi(q_0^2, \mathbf{0}) q_0 + \int \frac{dq_0}{2\pi} \Pi(q_0^2, \mathbf{0}) \frac{q_0}{q_0 - \omega + i\epsilon}. \end{aligned} \quad (18a)$$

Obtaining the dc conductivity from Eq. (18a) and (18b) corresponds to the results obtained from famous Kubo theory. However, it is not obvious whether we can obtain dc conductivity (16) from the limit of Eq. (18a): Firstly, to obtain Eq. (18b) from (18a) we need not only convergence of all the integrations, such as $\int \frac{dq_0}{2\pi} \Pi(q_0^2, \mathbf{0}) \frac{q_0^2}{\omega(q_0 - \omega + i\epsilon)}$, etc. but also proper subtraction of physics quantities. Secondly, when one chooses $\omega = 0$ directly in Eq. (18b), he will meet an uncomfortable situation: the first term in Eq. (18b) is an ambiguous $\frac{0}{0}$. To obtain right dc conductivity we should perform computation as follows: we calculate the ac conductivity in the course of nature from Eq. (18) at $\omega \neq 0$, with proper subtraction. At last we read the dc conductivity utilizing the limit of $\omega \rightarrow 0$. This is just pointed out by Kubo [8], which implies that, compare to results in references [3], results in references [4] is just the right results. Of course, all the results in references [3, 4] are obtained by perturbational approach.

After suitable subtraction, the ac conductivity is

$$\sigma = \int \frac{dq_0}{2\pi} \Pi(q_0^2, \mathbf{0}) \frac{q_0}{q_0 - \omega + i\epsilon}. \quad (19)$$

Generally, $\Pi(q_0^2, \mathbf{0})$ is not convergent or well defined, as will be shown by perturbative calculation in section 4. This is relevant to the wick definition of δ -function.

Therefore, in order to obtain meaningful physical result, we need to perform subtraction to cancel divergence. For instance, in Ref. [6] the author has proposed a soft δ -function. The subtraction should meet some physical criteria. For instance, as found in above paragraph, to get the result in Eq. (19) from Eq. (18), after the subtraction Π is still the function of q_0^2 rather than the function of q_0 in Fourier space. In section 4 we shall show a explicit subtraction to $\Pi(x_0, \mathbf{q})$.

3 Kramers-Krönig relation of graphene conductivity

In this section we show a relation between imaginary part and real part of graphene conductivity.

We first give a non-perturbational proof that $\Pi(q^2)$ is real. $\Pi(q^2)$ is real at $q^2 < 0$ obviously, the only needed is to prove that $\Pi(q^2)$ is also real at $q^2 > 0$.

At $q^2 > 0$, after inserting complete intermediate states $\sum_{\Gamma} |\Gamma\rangle\langle\Gamma|$, we have for $T \equiv T_{\mu}^{\mu}(q)$,

$$T = \int \frac{d^3x d^3p e^{iqx}}{(2\pi)^2} i(\theta(x_0) - \theta(-x_0))(e^{ipx} - e^{-ipx})s(p)\theta(p_0),$$

where the spectral function $s(p)$ is defined as

$$2\pi s(p) = \sum_{\Gamma} \langle |J^{\mu}(0)|\Gamma\rangle\langle\Gamma|J_{\mu}(0)|\rangle (2\pi)^3 \delta^3(p - p_{\Gamma}). \quad (20)$$

The spectral function $s(p)$, which is very close to state density, includes not only perturbational contributions, but also non-perturbational contributions. To study non-perturbational contributions, one should consider, for instance, excitations.

Inserting $\int_0^{\infty} dt \delta(p^2 - t) \equiv 1$ at $p^2 > 0$, one obtains

$$T = \int_0^{\infty} dt s(t) \int d^3x e^{iqx} i(\theta(x_0) - \theta(-x_0))I, \quad (21)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \int \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^2} \theta(p_0) \delta(p^2 - t) (e^{ipx} - e^{-ipx}) \\ &= \int \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^2} e^{-ipx} \delta(p^2 - t) (\theta(-p_0) - \theta(p_0)). \end{aligned}$$

Utilizing

$$\begin{aligned} & i \int \frac{d^3p e^{-ipx}}{(2\pi)^2} [\theta(x_0)\theta(p_0) + \theta(-x_0)\theta(-p_0)] \delta(p^2 - t) \\ &= - \int \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{e^{-ipx}}{p^2 - t + i\epsilon}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & i \int \frac{d^3p e^{-ipx}}{(2\pi)^2} [\theta(-x_0)\theta(p_0) + \theta(x_0)\theta(-p_0)] \delta(p^2 - t) \\ &= \int \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{e^{-ipx}}{p^2 - t - i\epsilon}, \end{aligned}$$

we finally get

$$T = 2P \int_0^{\infty} dt s(t) \frac{1}{q^2 - t} \quad (22)$$

with identity $\frac{1}{f \pm i\epsilon} = P\frac{1}{f} \mp i\pi\delta(f)$. Since $s(t) \geq 0$ is real, $T(q)$ and therefore $\Pi(q)$ are both real. The spectral density is in fact a very important function, which will be studied elsewhere [11].

Thus, from Eq. (19), we obtain an important relation between real part and imaginary part of conductivity σ

$$\text{Im}\sigma(\omega) = -\frac{\omega\Pi(\omega^2, \mathbf{0})}{2}, \quad \text{Re}\sigma(\omega) = P \int \frac{ds}{\pi} \frac{\text{Im}\sigma(s)}{\omega - s}. \quad (23)$$

This relationship between real part and imaginary part of conductivity is beyond the perturbation approach and can be considered as Kramers-Krönig relation of graphene conductivity. We hope the advanced study of graphene may check this relation.

Eq. (23) is one of the main results of the paper. It points out that the electrical response of graphene can never be considered as a pure resistance, but a resistance parallel connected with a capacitor with capacitivity $\Pi(\omega^2, \mathbf{0})/2$. Furthermore, due to the obvious relation between $\text{Im}\sigma$ and Π , $\text{Im}\sigma$ reflects the state structure of graphene. $\text{Im}\sigma$ is therefore a non-perturbational probe to detect the state structure of graphene. In this viewpoint, $\text{Im}\sigma$ is a more basic quantity than $\text{Re}\sigma$. Furthermore, Eq. (23) is irrelevant to the idiographic interactions, which means that, the equation holds under very general conditions, such as the existence of impurities or excitations in graphene.

More present works reveal that the graphene is rarely flat, *i.e.* there are always ripples in graphene. The non-vanishing curvature, raised by ripples, will lead two main effects: altering group velocity of quasiparticle and introducing effective gauge fields. The first effect possibly makes a global correction to conductivity, which may be absorbed into the redefinition of spectral function, Π . Furthermore, since the holding of Eq. (23) is irrelevant to idiographic interactions, we conclude that Kramers-Krönig relation is still valid for corrugated graphene.

Eq. (23) supplies one possible way to study the discrepancy of dc conductivity between theories and experiments. One may first perform perturbational computing to imaginary part of ac conductivity and then compares the perturbational result to experiments at different frequency. The discrepancy between these results reveals

contribution which can not be ascribed to perturbational theory. Furthermore, the complete contributions to dc conductivity are not only from the Dirac nodal point, but from the spectral structure of carriers.

4 Perturbational Calculation of dc conductivity

We here deduce the dc conductivity in perturbational approximation. After that we shall discuss an ambiguity besides the one pointed out in Ref. [6].

We begin the game by a perturbational calculation of $T_{\mu\nu}$. Noticing $\langle 0|b_{\mathbf{p}_f}a_{\mathbf{p}_f}^\dagger a_{\mathbf{p}_i}^\dagger b_{\mathbf{p}_i}|0\rangle = (2\pi)^4\delta^2(\mathbf{p}_f - \mathbf{p}_i)\delta^2(\mathbf{p}_f - \mathbf{p}_i)$ and the normal ordering of operators in current density, we have, for perturbational ground state,

$$\langle 0|J^\mu(x)J_\mu(0)|0\rangle = \int \frac{d^2\mathbf{p}d^2\mathbf{p}'}{(2\pi)^4 2p_0 2p'_0} F_\mu^\mu e^{-i(p+p')x}, \quad (24)$$

where $F_\mu^\mu = \bar{v}(\mathbf{p}')\gamma^{\mu u}u(\mathbf{p})\bar{u}(\mathbf{p})\gamma_\mu v(\mathbf{p}')$. Taking advantage of Eq. (3), one finds,

$$F_\mu^\mu = -2p \cdot p' - 6m^2 = -(p+p')^2 - 4m^2. \quad (25)$$

$T_\mu^\mu \equiv T$ is given by a direct computing

$$T(x) = i(\theta(x_0) - \theta(-x_0))(\square - 4m^2)K'(x), \quad (26)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} K'(x) &= \int \frac{d^2\mathbf{p}d^2\mathbf{p}'}{(2\pi)^4 2p_0 2p'_0} (e^{i(p+p')x} - e^{-i(p+p')x}) \\ &= \int \frac{d\mathbf{p}(e^{ipx} + e^{-ipx})}{(2\pi)^2 2p_0} \int \frac{d\mathbf{p}'(e^{ip'x} - e^{-ip'x})}{(2\pi)^2 2p'_0} \end{aligned}$$

From

$$\begin{aligned} \int \frac{d\mathbf{p}(e^{ipx} + e^{-ipx})}{(2\pi)^2 2p_0} &= \int \frac{d^3p e^{-ipx}}{(2\pi)^2} \delta(p^2 - m^2), \\ \int \frac{d\mathbf{p}(e^{ipx} - e^{-ipx})}{(2\pi)^2 2p_0} &= \int \frac{d^3p e^{-ipx}}{(2\pi)^2} \delta(p^2 - m^2) \text{sgn}(p_0), \end{aligned}$$

Fourier transformation of K' is

$$K'(p) = - \int \frac{d^3q}{2\pi} \delta((p-q)^2 - m^2) \delta(q^2 - m^2) \text{sgn}(q_0). \quad (27)$$

Here p does not need to be on mass shell, *i.e.* $p_0 = \sqrt{\mathbf{p}^2 + m^2}$ is not needed, if the integrating factor is d^3p . We focus on the case of $\mathbf{p} = 0$ (Or, p is a time-like vector). Letting $K(x) = (\square - 4m^2)K'(x)$ and $K(q_0) = K(q_0, \mathbf{q} = \mathbf{0})$, we get

$$K(q_0) = \frac{q_0^2 + 4m^2}{4q_0} \theta(q_0^2 - 4m^2). \quad (28)$$

The nonzero contribution to $K(q_0)$ is $|q_0| > 2m$. To simplify we let $m = 0$. Thus $T(x_0, \mathbf{p} = 0) = \frac{1}{4}(\theta(-x_0) - \theta(x_0))\delta'(x_0)$. Since $\Pi(q_0, \mathbf{q} = 0) = -\frac{1}{2q_0}T(q_0, \mathbf{q} = 0)$, we find the dc conductivity of graphene

$$\sigma = \frac{1}{8} \int_{-\infty}^0 dx_1 \int_{-\infty}^{x_1} dx_2 (\theta(-x_2) - \theta(x_2))\delta'(x_2), \quad (29)$$

utilizing Eq. (16). Notice that in above equation we have made a subtraction $\Pi(x_0, \mathbf{p}) = \frac{\partial \Pi(x_0, \mathbf{p})}{\partial x_0} = 0$ at $x_0 \rightarrow -\infty$.

However, the functions, such as $\delta'(x)$ and $\theta(x)$, are not well defined. This means that there possibly exists ambiguity in Eq. (29). This ambiguity is different to the one pointed out in Ref. [6].

We consider dc conductivity here. First let $\delta(x)$ be the simplest form, $\delta_1(x) = 0$ for $|x| > \frac{a}{2}$ and $\delta_1(x) = 1/a$ for $|x| < \frac{a}{2}$. In this case we obtain $\sigma_1 = \frac{1}{16} = \frac{\pi}{8} \frac{1}{2\pi} \simeq \frac{0.39}{2\pi}$ utilizing Eq. (29). This is just the result obtained in Ref. [4]. Meanwhile, we can also let $\delta(x)$ be a somewhat complex form^[6], $\delta_2(x) = \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{\eta}{x^2 + \eta^2}$. At this time we get $\sigma_2 = \frac{4+\pi^2}{16\pi} \frac{1}{2\pi} \simeq \frac{0.28}{2\pi}$. Finally, we can also set $\delta_3(x) = \frac{1}{4T_0} \cosh^2(\frac{x}{2T_0})$. We find $\sigma_3 = \frac{\pi(1/2 + \ln 2)}{12} \frac{1}{2\pi} \simeq \frac{0.31}{2\pi} \simeq \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{1}{2\pi}$, numeral value of which is in agreement with that in ref. [3].

To see the physics meaning of T_0 in $\delta_3(x)$, we write out explicitly: $\theta(-x) = \frac{1}{1+e^{x/T_0}}$. The role of T_0 is some like temperature, which means that T_0^{-1} symbolizes the disorder. a^{-1} in $\delta_1(x)$ and η in $\delta_2(x)$ ^[6] play the similar role. Since σ_1 , σ_2 and σ_3 are a^{-} , η^{-} and T_0 -independent respectively, we conclude that the dc conductivity is almost temperature-independent near zero temperature, although the conductivity value is ambiguous because of the wicked behavior of δ -function. This is verified by experiments^[12].

This is an unexpected occasion that the conductivity, a physical observable quantity, varies with different definitions of δ -function. The ambiguity is associated by the different definitions of δ -function at ultraviolet region. One may argue that we can eliminate the ambiguity by a standard renormalization schedule in quantum field theory^[9,10], however, this elimination is still contributed to the special definition of δ -function at ultraviolet region. We think that the ambiguity implies that the dc conductivity of graphene depends on the behavior of quasielectrons at high energy as well as the behavior at Dirac nodal point. This is also pointed by Kramers-Krönig relation in Eq. (23). Unfortunately, linear dispersion relation of quasielectron does not hold at high energy, which means that, different numeral values based on linear dispersion and perturbational approaches, need corrections. On the other hand, when

we study electrical response of graphene, we always perform calculations utilizing diagrams composed by different Green functions. To include higher corrections, we should use loop diagrams. However, since coupling $g = 2\pi e^2 / \epsilon \hbar v_F$ is not small, $g \sim 1$, comparing to leading order, the loop corrections can not be ignored.

One possibly expects that the correction to conductivity given above are not large. If this is the case, our computations and others [3,4] indicate that about 30% of the full conductivity is from the perturbational contribution. A question is raised, then, where other contributions to conductivity come from. A generalized version of Eq. (28) tells us that, from the definition of state density $s(q)$, perturbational contribution to state density is

$$2\pi s^{pt}(q) = \frac{q^2 + 4m^2}{4q} \theta(q^2 - 4m^2), \quad (30)$$

at $q_0 > 0$. θ function in this equation reveals that, s^{pt} only includes the contribution from pairs of *free* quasi-electron and hole. However, since there are complex interactions between electron and hole, electron and hole may be combined into excitations [14,15], or in other words, it is questionable to consider quasielectrons in graphene as 2-dimensional electron gas with no interacting. To study electrical responses completely, one must also consider the contribution of excitations (and impurities), attributed to Eq. (22). In standard field theory it is difficult to study the contribution perturbationally. We often nominate the contribution as non-perturbational one, such as we did in Ref. [13]. Since the coupling is large on graphene, such contribution can not be ignored when one consider electrical responses. Apparently, if m is large enough, the nonzero contribution from exciton appears before $q^2 = 4m^2$. We shall discuss such contribution elsewhere [11].

5 Discussion

The relationship between imaginary part, $\text{Im}\sigma$, and real part, $\text{Re}\sigma$, of ac conductivity is given in paper. $\text{Im}\sigma$ depends directly on details of state structure and one can study state structure from $\text{Im}\sigma$. We consider it as a non-perturbational probe to detect state structure of graphene and it is therefore a very important quantity. Our formulae are Lorenz-covariant and local-gauge-invariant.

We also perform an explicit perturbational calculation using quantum field theory. The computing shows that the conductivity is mainly manipulated by the momentum-energy relation and there is little nexus between the conductivity and state density near Dirac nodal point. The computing reveals that, due to the

wicked behavior of δ -function, there is ambiguity in graphene conductivity calculations. We argue that the full perturbational studies need two corrections: one is due to the incorrectness of carrier linear dispersion at high-energy and the other is higher order correction. Besides these corrections, however, there is a furthermore correction which is nominated as non-perturbational corrections in the paper. This correction comes from the contribution of excitations, which is attributed to electron-electron interactions.

Authors are very grateful to Dr. M.G. Xia and Dr. E.H. Zhang. This work is supported by the Ministry of Science and Technology of China through 973 - project under grant No. 2002CB613307, the National Natural Science Foundation of China under grant No. 50472052 and No. 60528008.

References

- [1] M.I. Katsnelson and K.S. Novoselov, cond-mat/0703742.
- [2] V.P. Gusynin, S.G. Sharapov, J.P. Carbotte, Intern. J. Mod. Phys. **B 21**, 4611 (2007); Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 256802 (2006).
- [3] A.W.W. Ludwig, M.P.A. Fisher, R. Shankar, and G. Grinstein, Phys. Rev. **B 50**, 7526 (1994); K. Ziegler, Phys. Rev. **B 55**, 10661 (1997); Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 3113 (1998); M.I. Katsnelson, Eur. Phys. J. **B 51**, 157 (2006); V.P. Gusynin and S.G. Sharapov, Phys. Rev. **B 66**, 045108 (2002); Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 146801 (2005); Phys. Rev. **B 73**, 245411 (2006); N.M.R. Peres, F. Guinea, and A.H.C. Neto, Phys. Rev. **B 73**, 125411 (2006); J. Tworzydło, B. Trauzettel, M. Titov, A. Rycerz, and C. Beenakker, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 246802 (2006); J. Cserti, Phys. Rev. **B 75**, 033405 (2007); P.M. Ostrovsky, I.V. Gornyi, A.D. Mirlin, Phys. Rev. **B 74**, 235443 (2006); S. Ryu, C. Mudry, A. Furusaki, A.W.W. Ludwig, cond-mat/0610598.
- [4] A.W.W. Ludwig, M.P.A. Fisher, R. Shankar, and G. Grinstein, Phys. Rev. **B 50**, 7526 (1994); J. Cserti, Phys. Rev. **B 75**, 033405 (2007); L.A. Falkovsky and A.A. Varlamov, cond-mat/0606800.
- [5] P.R. Wallace, Phys. Rev. **71**, 622 (1947); J.M. Luttinger and W. Kohn, Phys. Rev. **97**, 869 (1955); J.W. McClure, Phys. Rev. **104**, 666 (1956); J.C. Slonczewski and P.R. Weiss, Phys. Rev. **109** 272 (1958).
- [6] K. Ziegler, Phys. Rev. **B 75**, 233407 (2007); Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 266802 (2006).

- [7] J. Gonzalez, F. Guinea and M.A.H. Vozmediano, Phys. Rev. **B59**, 2474 (1999); S.D. Sarma, E.H. Hwang and W.K. Tse, Phys. Rev. **B 75**, 121406 (2007).
- [8] R. Kubo, Canad. J. Phys. **34**, 1274 (1956).
- [9] S. Weinberg, The Quantum Theory of Fields, Vol. 1, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1995.
- [10] M.E. Peskin and D.V. Schroeder, An Introduction to Quantum Field Theory, Part 1, Addison-Wesley Pub. Com. USA, 1997.
- [11] D.Q. Liu and S.L. Zhang, Effect on Electrical Responses from the Nonperturbative Behavior, in preprinting.
- [12] K.S. Novoselov, *et al*, Nature **438**, 197 (2005).
- [13] M.A. Shifman, ITEP Lectures on Particle Physics and Field Theory(Wold Scientific, University of Minnesota, 1999).
- [14] A. Iyengar *et al*, Phys. Rev. **B75**, 125430 (2007).
- [15] A. Bostwick *et al*, Nature Phys. **3**, 36, (2007); F. Rana, arXiv:0710.3556.