

Pseudo-magnetic catalysis of the time-reversal-symmetry breaking in graphene

Igor F. Herbut

Department of Physics, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada V5A 1S6

Finite flux of the (time-reversal-symmetric) pseudo-magnetic field, which represents the effect of wrinkling of the graphene sheet for example, is shown to be a catalyst for spontaneous breaking of the time-reversal symmetry of Dirac fermions in two dimensions. Possible experimental consequences of this effect for graphene are discussed.

The Dirac nature of graphene's quasiparticles provides these low-energy excitations with an extra protection from the effects of electron-electron interactions. The semi-metallic, non-interacting ground state of electrons in graphene may be understood as a Gaussian fixed point in the space of coupling constants, stable in all directions. Nevertheless, the ground state can in principle be turned into one with a broken symmetry at a finite, and, relative to the bandwidth, typically large interaction [1]. This way, for example, the system may develop a finite staggered density, or a staggered magnetization, at a large nearest-neighbor and on-site repulsion, respectively. Both of these order parameters correspond to finite "masses" of the Dirac fermions that reduce the chiral ("valley", or "pseudo-spin") $SU(2)$ symmetry of the linearized Hamiltonian down to $U(1)$. The two-dimensional Dirac Hamiltonian, however, admits an additional mass-term which is invariant under the chiral symmetry, but odd under time-reversal [2]. It has been argued recently that such a time-reversal-symmetry-breaking mass would be generated dynamically at a large second-nearest-neighbor repulsion between electrons on a honeycomb lattice [3]. The answer to the question of which mass, or an order parameter, would eventually open up at strong coupling, seems to depend therefore on the non-universal details of the interactions on the atomic scale.

Increasing the density of states near the Dirac point is expected to enhance the effects of interactions in graphene. A manifestation of this general principle is the magnetic catalysis, by which the chiral-symmetry-breaking mass is induced at an infinitesimal favorable interaction in a uniform magnetic field [4], [5]. This mechanism is at the heart of several recent theories of some of the quantum Hall effects observed in graphene [6, 7, 8]. Magnetic field cannot catalyze the time-reversal-symmetry-breaking mass, however [9]. The purpose of this note is to show that the flux of the (non-abelian) pseudo-magnetic field plays the role of such a catalyzer. I will argue that in the presence of a finite flux of the non-abelian gauge field an infinitesimal favorable interaction would lead to the spontaneous breaking of the time-reversal symmetry of the ground state of two-dimensional Dirac fermions. Possible practical significance of this observation lies in the fact that a component of such a pseudo-magnetic field represents the main effect of ripples of graphene's surface on Dirac quasiparticles [10]. Both the uniform and a localized pseudo-magnetic flux

are considered, and it is demonstrated that even the latter, albeit only locally, catalyzes a finite time-reversal-symmetry-breaking mass. Experimental signs of this interesting manifestation of the coupling between the electronic and mechanical degrees of freedom rather unique to graphene are discussed.

Consider the Dirac Hamiltonian for the four-component massless fermions in two spatial dimensions:

$$H[A^0, A] = i\gamma_0\gamma_i(p_i - A_i^0 - A_i), \quad (1)$$

where the repeated index $i = 1, 2$ is summed over, and A_i is the general non-abelian $SU(2)$ gauge field

$$A_i = A_i^3\gamma_3 + A_i^5\gamma_5 + A_i^{35}\gamma_{35} \quad (2)$$

where $\gamma_{35} = i\gamma_3\gamma_5$. A_i^0 is the $U(1)$ (abelian) component that represents the physical magnetic field, whereas A_i^j , $j = 3, 5, 35$ multiply the three generators of the chiral $SU(2)$ symmetry [11] of the free Dirac Hamiltonian $H[0, 0]$. The five gamma-matrices satisfy $\{\gamma_\mu, \gamma_\nu\} = 2\delta_{\mu\nu}$, $\mu = 0, 1, 2, 3, 5$, and we will define them here to be all Hermitian. In our units, $\hbar = e = c = 1$.

The general mass-term that can be added to the Hamiltonian (1) which violates the $SU(2)$ chiral symmetry is given by $M = \vec{m} \cdot \vec{M}$, where $\vec{M} = (\gamma_0, i\gamma_0\gamma_3, i\gamma_0\gamma_5)$ is a vector under the chiral transformations. An additional mass-term may then be defined to be a chiral scalar: $\tilde{m}\tilde{M}$, with $\tilde{M} = i\gamma_1\gamma_2$. It is easy to check that the set of all linearly independent matrices that anticommute with the free Dirac Hamiltonian $H[0, 0]$ is exhausted by \vec{M} and \tilde{M} , which therefore represent all the possible mass-terms.

An important role in our discussion will be played by the time-reversal symmetry of the free Dirac Hamiltonian. As usual, the time-reversal is represented by an anti-unitary operator $I_t = U_t K$, where U_t is unitary, and K stands for the complex conjugation [12]. Although everything that will be discussed hereafter will be manifestly representation-independent, to exhibit the time-reversal operator one needs some representation of the γ -matrices. We prefer the "graphene representation" introduced earlier [1], in which $\gamma_0 = I_2 \otimes \sigma_z$, $\gamma_1 = \sigma_z \otimes \sigma_y$, $\gamma_2 = I_2 \otimes \sigma_x$, $\gamma_3 = \sigma_x \otimes \sigma_y$, and $\gamma_5 = \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y$, with $\{I_2, \vec{\sigma}\}$ as the standard Pauli basis in the space of two-dimensional matrices. In this representation the time-reversal invariance of the free Dirac Hamiltonian $H[0, 0]$ and of the general chiral-symmetry-breaking mass M determines the unitary part of the time-reversal operator

uniquely to be:

$$U_t = i\gamma_1\gamma_5 = (\sigma_x \otimes I_2). \quad (3)$$

Postulating time-reversal invariance of both $H[0,0]$ and M is motivated by the fact that these operators represent the low-energy limit of a completely real lattice Hamiltonian [13]. As an immediate consequence, the chiral-symmetry preserving mass \tilde{M} must be *odd* under time-reversal. This is then also in accord with the concrete lattice realization of a finite \tilde{M} provided in [2].

We begin by reformulating the mechanism of the magnetic catalysis in purely algebraic terms. Consider the Hamiltonian $H[A^0,0]$ with $A^0 \neq 0$. By virtue of representing the physical magnetic field $H[A^0,0]$ then has the time-reversal symmetry broken, but the chiral symmetry preserved. In general, the spectrum of $H[A^0,0]$ will contain states with exactly zero energy [14]. Let us denote that zero-energy subspace of the full Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_0 . \mathcal{H}_0 is invariant under the generators of the chiral symmetry which by definition all commute with $H[A^0,0]$, but also under the operators that anticommute with $H[A^0,0]$, such as \vec{M} and \tilde{M} . If we denote the trace of an operator *within* \mathcal{H}_0 as Tr_0 , it follows that

$$Tr_0\vec{M} = 0. \quad (4)$$

This is because for each component of \vec{M} there exists an operator which leaves \mathcal{H}_0 invariant and anticommutes with it [15]. In the basis of \mathcal{H}_0 which diagonalizes a chosen component of \vec{M} the number of states with the eigenvalue +1 is thus equal to the number of those with the eigenvalue -1. Since one can write the ground state expectation value of a traceless operator that anticommutes with the Hamiltonian, such as \vec{M} , as [16], [17],

$$\langle \vec{M} \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \left[\sum_{n,occup} - \sum_{n,empty} \right] \Phi_{0,n}^\dagger(\vec{x}) \vec{M} \Phi_{0,n}(\vec{x}), \quad (5)$$

with $\{\Phi_{0,n}\}$ as a basis in \mathcal{H}_0 , we see that occupying all the +1 zero-energy eigenstates and leaving the -1 eigenstates empty creates the maximal spatial average of the above order parameter. At half-filling and in the non-interacting system, of course, the ground state is highly degenerate, and averaging over all the ground states ultimately leads to zero order parameter. Nevertheless, in presence of even an infinitesimal interaction that favors a finite above expectation value, the non-interacting ground state is unstable towards a state in which all +1 states would be shifted slightly downward and all -1 states upward in energy, so that the chiral symmetry would become spontaneously broken.

In a uniform magnetic field the above mechanism leads to a constant chiral-symmetry-breaking order parameter, and a gap in the spectrum at an infinitesimal favorable interaction between Dirac fermions, i. e. "magnetic catalysis" [4], [16]. Obviously the mechanism is quite general, and as will be discussed here it will be operative even if

the magnetic field is non-uniform, as long there is a finite support of the energy spectrum at zero.

Before turning to our main problem, it is instructive to see why the above mechanism does not lead to the catalysis of the chirally symmetric order parameter $\langle \tilde{M} \rangle$. First, note that unlike \vec{M} , \tilde{M} commutes with *all* the other operators that leave \mathcal{H}_0 invariant, i. e. the generators of $SU(2)$ and \vec{M} , so it does not readily follow that its trace within \mathcal{H}_0 must vanish. In fact, since

$$H^2[A^0,0] = (p_i - A_i^0)^2 + \tilde{M}\epsilon_{ij}\partial_i A_j^0, \quad (6)$$

at least for an uniform (and say, positive) magnetic field it is obvious that all states in \mathcal{H}_0 have the same (-1) eigenvalue of \tilde{M} . That this is generally true may be seen by rewriting the Dirac Hamiltonian in the magnetic field and in the Coulomb gauge $\partial_i A_i^0 = 0$ as

$$H[A^0,0] = e^{-\chi(\vec{x})\tilde{M}} H[0,0] e^{-\chi(\vec{x})\tilde{M}}, \quad (7)$$

where $A_i^0 = \epsilon_{ij}\partial_j\chi$. From this (non-unitary) transformation it follows that the zero-energy states of $H[A^0,0]$ and of the free Hamiltonian are related as

$$\Phi_{0,n}[A^0](\vec{x}) \propto e^{\chi(\vec{x})\tilde{M}} \Phi_{0,n}[0](\vec{x}). \quad (8)$$

Since for a total flux F (in units of hc/e) localized near the origin $\chi(\vec{x}) = F \ln|\vec{x}|$ at large $|\vec{x}|$, the last equation implies that only the zero-energy eigenstates of $H[0,0]$ with the eigenvalue -1 of \tilde{M} have a chance of producing normalizable states of $H[A^0,0]$. All the states in \mathcal{H}_0 are thus the -1 eigenstates of \tilde{M} , for an *arbitrary* configuration of the magnetic field. Eq. (5) then implies that $\langle \tilde{M} \rangle = 0$ at half-filling for *any* occupation of the zero-energy states.

To summarize, at the filling one-half, the ground state of the Dirac Hamiltonian $H[A^0,0]$ in Eq. (1) in presence of a finite magnetic flux, which breaks the time-reversal and preserves the chiral symmetry, is unstable towards the dynamical generation of the mass, which turns out breaks the chiral, but preserves the time-reversal symmetry. I show next that when the physical (abelian) magnetic field vanishes and only the (non-abelian) pseudo-magnetic field is present, the same may be said, only with the "time-reversal" and "chiral symmetry" in the last sentence exchanged.

The time-reversal symmetry, being broken by the magnetic field, did not play any role in the above discussion of the usual magnetic catalysis. Let us consider now the Hamiltonian $H[0,A]$ in Eq. (1), but now with $A \neq 0$. Since the time-reversal operator I_t commutes with all the generators of $SU(2)$, it follows that $H[0,A]$ is *even* under time-reversal. For a general non-abelian gauge configuration A the chiral $SU(2)$ symmetry of the free Hamiltonian will be completely broken, and if A is everywhere proportional to one and the same linear combination of the generators it will be reduced to $U(1)$. \tilde{M} , however, still always anticommutes with $H[0,A]$. When not empty, \mathcal{H}_0 in this case will thus still be invariant under \tilde{M} , but now

also under I_t . As we have found already that these two operators must anticommute, it immediately follows that in this case,

$$Tr_0 \tilde{M} = 0. \quad (9)$$

Substituting \tilde{M} for \vec{M} in Eq. (5), it is now the chiral-symmetry-preserving, time-reversal-symmetry-breaking order parameter $\langle \tilde{M} \rangle$ that will become catalyzed in presence of an infinitesimal favorable interaction.

Chiral-symmetry-breaking mass, in turn, is not catalyzed by the non-abelian gauge field. Assume for example that $A_i = A_i^{35} \gamma_{35}$, and $A_i^0 = 0$. Similar to Eq. (7) we can then write [18]

$$H[0, A] = e^{-\phi(\vec{x})\gamma_0} H[0, 0] e^{-\phi(\vec{x})\gamma_0}, \quad (10)$$

where now $A_i^{35} = \epsilon_{ij} \partial_j \phi$. In analogy with the Eq. (8) it follows that all the states in \mathcal{H}_0 now have the same eigenvalue of γ_0 , and it is the chiral-symmetry-breaking order parameter $\langle \gamma_0 \rangle$ that always vanishes at half-filling.

To see more explicitly the above mechanism at work let us consider an interacting Lagrangian density

$$\mathcal{L} = \bar{\Psi}(x) \gamma_\mu (\partial_\mu - A_\mu^{35} \gamma_{35}) \Psi(x) - \frac{g}{2} (\Psi^\dagger(x) \tilde{M} \Psi(x))^2 \quad (11)$$

with an interaction $g > 0$, $\mu = 0, 1, 2$, $x = (x_0, \vec{x})$, x_0 as the imaginary time, and the quenched component of the non-abelian gauge field $A_i^{35}(\vec{x}) \neq 0$. Introducing the Hubbard-Stratonovich field this can be rewritten as

$$\mathcal{L} = \bar{\Psi}(x) \gamma_\mu (\partial_\mu - A_\mu^{35}(\vec{x}) \gamma_{35}) \Psi(x) + \frac{1}{2g} \tilde{m}^2(x) - \tilde{m}(x) \Psi^\dagger(x) \tilde{M} \Psi(x). \quad (12)$$

The mean-field theory of the above interacting problem would amount to minimization of the corresponding action $\int \mathcal{L} dx$ with respect to $\tilde{m}(x)$, or equivalently, to determining the ground-state expectation value

$$\langle \Psi^\dagger(x) \tilde{M} \Psi(x) \rangle = \langle \tilde{m}(x) \rangle / g, \quad (13)$$

self-consistently. For a uniform pseudo-magnetic field $B^{35} = \partial_1 A_2^{35} - \partial_2 A_1^{35}$, in close analogy to the standard magnetic catalysis [4], [7] we then find

$$\langle \Psi^\dagger(x) \tilde{M} \Psi(x) \rangle = B^{35} + O(g), \quad (14)$$

where the first term derives from the split zero-energy level and the $O(g)$ is due the other Landau levels. For an inhomogeneous $B^{35}(\vec{x})$ the self-consistent calculation can be performed only numerically. Here we circumvent this hurdle by dropping the self-consistency requirement and minimizing the action with respect to only a *uniform* \tilde{m} . This is equivalent to replacing the contact interaction in Eq. (11) with the interaction of infinite range [19]:

$$- \frac{g}{2\Omega} \int dy (\Psi^\dagger(x) \tilde{M} \Psi(x)) (\Psi^\dagger(y) \tilde{M} \Psi(y)), \quad (15)$$

with Ω as the area of the system, so that the uniform ansatz becomes an exact solution of the modified theory in the thermodynamic limit $\Omega \rightarrow \infty$. In either case there is a gap of $2\tilde{m}$ in the spectrum, which satisfies:

$$\frac{\tilde{m}}{g} = \frac{F}{\Omega} + \tilde{m} \int_0^\infty \frac{\mathcal{N}(\epsilon) d\epsilon}{(\epsilon^2 + \tilde{m}^2)^{1/2}}, \quad (16)$$

with $\mathcal{N}(\epsilon)$ as the exact density of states per unit area of the non-interacting Dirac fermions in the flux of A_i^{35} , at $\epsilon \neq 0$. Since at small energy $\mathcal{N}(\epsilon) \propto \epsilon^{(2-z)/z}$ [20], for $z < 2$ the second term may be neglected at a weak coupling, and \tilde{m} is finite in the thermodynamic limit only in the case of an extensive flux [21]. Nevertheless, even in the case of a finite F the expectation value of the time-reversal symmetry breaking order parameter is finite, since

$$\lim_{\Omega \rightarrow \infty} \langle \Psi^\dagger(x) \tilde{M} \Psi(x) \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathcal{H}_0} \Phi_{0,n}^\dagger(\vec{x}) \Phi_{0,n}(\vec{x}). \quad (17)$$

A finite pseudo-flux selects the time-reversal-symmetry broken ground state out of the degenerate manifold, in close parallel with the standard formalism of spontaneous symmetry breaking [22].

As an illustration, let us explicitly evaluate the sum in the last equation for a localized finite flux F . For simplicity, choose a cylindrically-symmetric pseudo-magnetic field

$$B^{35}(r) = \frac{2F}{R^2(1 + (r/R)^2)^2}. \quad (18)$$

In the graphene representation the zero-energy state with ± 1 eigenvalue of \tilde{M} are then $\Phi_{n,-}^\dagger(\vec{x}) = f_n^*(\vec{x})(0, 1, 0, 0)$, and $\Phi_{n,+}^\dagger(\vec{x}) = f_n(\vec{x})(0, 0, 0, 1)$, where

$$f_n(\vec{x}) = \frac{\pi^{-1} R^{-2(n+1)}}{(\beta(n+1, F-n-1))^{1/2}} \frac{(x+iy)^n}{(1 + (r/R)^2)^{F/2}}, \quad (19)$$

with the integer $n < F$. Note that the $\Phi_{n,+} = I_t \Phi_{n,-}$. For an integer flux F then the sum in Eq. (17) can be exactly performed with a particularly transparent result [23]

$$\lim_{\Omega \rightarrow \infty} \langle \Psi^\dagger(\vec{x}) \tilde{M} \Psi(\vec{x}) \rangle = (1 - \frac{1}{F}) B^{35}(r). \quad (20)$$

For a general localized flux the proportionality between the order parameter and the field obtains only in the limit $F \gg 1$. The order parameter, however, is still always localized in the region of flux, but in general not exactly proportional to it.

Finally, let us address possible consequences of the above results for graphene. As mentioned in the introduction, the time-reversal-symmetry-breaking mass is favored by the second-nearest-neighbor repulsion [3], whereas the competing chiral-symmetry-breaking masses are favored by the nearest-neighbor repulsion between

electrons. With the electron spin included, chiral-symmetry-breaking mass with the opposite sign for the two spin components, which corresponds to staggered magnetization, is also favored by the, most likely the strongest, on-site repulsion [1]. As one has little control over the size of the interaction couplings and can hope only to alter the bandwidth, possible instability towards the time-reversal-symmetry-breaking mass without any gauge fields seems likely to be inferior to the one towards chiral-symmetry breaking. An application of the pseudo-magnetic flux, however, changes this, since it is only the time-reversal-symmetry-breaking mass that is catalyzed by it at weak interactions, whereas the chiral-symmetry-breaking masses do not. On the contrary, in a uniform pseudo-flux, as the zero-energy level does not contribute and the rest of the spectrum is gapped, breaking of the chiral symmetry is even inhibited by a finite B^{35} . The order parameter $\langle \tilde{M} \rangle$ should thus be favored by a finite pseudo-magnetic field, at least for the repulsive couplings that are weak enough not to break the symmetries at zero fields.

A crude estimate of the locally catalyzed gap in the density of states gives $\tilde{m} \approx VB^{35}/B_{latt}$, where $B_{latt} \approx$

$10^4 T$ is the characteristic lattice magnetic field scale, and $V \sim 1eV$ is the strength of the second-nearest-neighbor repulsion. Assuming $B^{35} \sim 1T$ [24] [25] to correspond to a typical wrinkle in the graphene sheet yields then $\tilde{m} \sim 10^{-1}meV$. Deliberately bulging graphene to induce a larger net pseudo-flux should then lead to an observable gap in the local density of states.

To conclude, I described a mechanism complementary to the usual magnetic catalysis: a finite flux of a component of the non-abelian gauge field, which preserves the time-reversal and breaks the chiral symmetry of the free Dirac Hamiltonian, serves as a catalyst of the time-reversal-symmetry-breaking, chiral-symmetry-preserving order parameter. This could lead to spontaneous breaking of the time reversal symmetry in graphene where such a pseudo-magnetic field is provided by a bump in graphene's plane, due to the second-nearest-neighbor repulsion term in the lattice Hamiltonian. The magnitude of the effect appears to be large enough for the gap in the local density of states to be observable by scanning tunneling microscopy, for example [26].

This work is supported by the NSERC of Canada.

-
- [1] I. F. Herbut, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 146401 (2006), and references therein.
- [2] F. D. M. Haldane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 2015 (1988).
- [3] S. Raghu, Xiao-Liang Qi, C. Honerkamp, S.-C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 156401 (2008).
- [4] V. P. Gusynin, V. A. Miransky, and I. A. Shovkovy, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 3499 (1994); Phys. Rev. D **52**, 4718 (1995).
- [5] D. V. Khveshchenko, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 206401 (2001); *ibid.* **87**, 246802 (2001).
- [6] V. P. Gusynin, V. A. Miransky, S. G. Sharapov, and I. A. Shovkovy, Phys. Rev. B **74**, 195429 (2006); E. V. Gorbar, V. P. Gusynin, V. A. Miransky, preprint arXiv:0710.3527.
- [7] I. F. Herbut, Phys. Rev. B **75**, 165411 (2007); *ibid.* **76**, 085432 (2007); I. F. Herbut and B. Roy, preprint arXiv:0802.2546.
- [8] J.-N. Fuchs and P. Lederer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 016803 (2007).
- [9] See the discussion around Eqs. (6)-(8) in the text.
- [10] For a review, see A. H. Castro Neto, F. Guinea, N. M. R. Peres, K. S. Novoselov, A. K. Geim, preprint arXiv:0709.1163.
- [11] For the chiral symmetry of d-wave superconductors, see I. F. Herbut, Phys. Rev. B **66**, 094504 (2002); Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 237001 (2005); Z. Tešanović, O. Vafek, and M. Franz, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 180511 (2002); D. J. Lee and I. F. Herbut, Phys. Rev. B **66**, 094512 (2002).
- [12] E. P. Wigner, *Group Theory*, (Academic Press, 1959).
- [13] G. W. Semenoff, Phys. Rev. Lett. **53**, 2449 (1984).
- [14] Y. Aharonov and A. Casher, Phys. Rev. A **19**, 2461 (1979).
- [15] For the same reason $Tr_0\Gamma = 0$, where Γ is a generator of the chiral $SU(2)$.
- [16] G. W. Semenoff, I. A. Shovkovy, and L. C. R. Wijewardhana, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 105024 (1999).
- [17] I. F. Herbut, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 206404 (2007).
- [18] R. Jackiw and S.-Y. Pi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 266402 (2007).
- [19] Z. Tešanović and I. F. Herbut, Phys. Rev. B **50**, 10389 (1994).
- [20] A. W. W. Ludwig, M. P. A. Fisher, R. Shankar, and G. Grinstein, Phys. Rev. B **50**, 7526 (1994).
- [21] If $z \geq 2\tilde{m}$ becomes finite at an infinitesimal interaction even if $F = 0$. See also, F. Guinea, B. Horovitz, and P. Le Doussal, preprint arXiv:0803.1958.
- [22] I. Herbut, *A Modern Approach to Critical Phenomena*, (Cambridge University Press, 2007).
- [23] G. Dunne and T. Hall, Phys. Rev. D **53**, 2220 (1995).
- [24] S. V. Morozov *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 016801 (2006).
- [25] I. F. Herbut, V. Juričić, O. Vafek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 046403 (2008).
- [26] G. Li, A. Luican, and E. Andrei, preprint arXiv:0803.4016